

This electronic thesis or dissertation has been downloaded from the King's Research Portal at <https://kclpure.kcl.ac.uk/portal/>



Studies in representations and perceptions of the Carolingians in Italy 774-875.

West, Geoffrey Valerio Buckle

The copyright of this thesis rests with the author and no quotation from it or information derived from it may be published without proper acknowledgement.

END USER LICENCE AGREEMENT



Unless another licence is stated on the immediately following page this work is licensed

under a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives 4.0 International

licence. <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>

You are free to copy, distribute and transmit the work

Under the following conditions:

- Attribution: You must attribute the work in the manner specified by the author (but not in any way that suggests that they endorse you or your use of the work).
- Non Commercial: You may not use this work for commercial purposes.
- No Derivative Works - You may not alter, transform, or build upon this work.

Any of these conditions can be waived if you receive permission from the author. Your fair dealings and other rights are in no way affected by the above.

Take down policy

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact librarypure@kcl.ac.uk providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

**Studies in
Representations and Perceptions
of the Carolingians in Italy
774-875**

**by
Geoffrey Valerio Buckle West**

**submitted for the degree of PhD
King's College, London**

April 1998



Abstract

This thesis describes aspects of the representation and perception of the Carolingians in Italy between 774 and 875. This relates to the impact of Carolingian ideology in Italy. The thesis is composed of a series of parallel source studies. Most of the material considered was produced away from the Carolingian court and thus reveals the reaction of those in the provinces. Even when, as with capitularies, the material discussed originated at the court, the selection of which pieces to preserve is nevertheless sometimes indicative of the priorities of those involved. The thesis is composed of six chapters and a short coda. Chapter one is an introduction which deals with the historiography of the subject, outlines the aims of this study and delineates the difficulties associated with it. Chapters two and three deal with narrative sources written, respectively, within the *regnum Italiae* and those written outside it in southern Italy. These two chapters consider the descriptions of the Carolingians contained in these texts in the light of the literary approaches of these works. Chapter four analyses other literary productions linked with or referring to the Carolingians in Italy, mostly poems. Chapter five discusses the numismatic evidence about Carolingian government in Italy and the coinage's capacity to carry ideological messages. Chapter six considers the evidence of Carolingian capitularies in Italy, the promulgation of these texts and their use in the peninsula. Particular attention is devoted to the methodological problems involved with using each of these types of source. Thus a partial image is developed of the ideological profile of Carolingian rule in Italy and of the reaction to it. The coda, chapter seven, describes the place of this work in the historiography and suggests further approaches.

CONTENTS

Acknowledgements	5
Abbreviations	7
ONE <u>Introduction</u>	10
Defining the Field: Historiography	10
Problems, Limits, Aims	22
TWO <u>Narrative Sources I: the <i>Regnum Italiae</i></u>	28
<i>Historia Langobardorum Codex Gothani</i>	29
Agnellus of Ravenna	36
Andreas of Bergamo	55
<i>Chronicon Brixense</i>	77
<i>Libellus de potestate imperatoria urbe Roma</i>	83
THREE <u>Narrative Sources II: the South</u>	93
<i>Chronica Sancti Benedicti Casinensis</i>	93
Erchempert of Montecassino	98
<i>Vita Athanasii</i>	110
<i>Gesta Episcoporum Neapolitanorum</i>	113
Concluding Comments	119
FOUR <u>Literary Productions and the Carolingians in Italy</u>	132
Poetry	137
Epitaphs	153
Audiences	158
FIVE <u>Coins in Carolingian Italy</u>	165
Introductory comments	165
Northern Italy	169
Papal Coins	173
Monograms	175
Benevento and Venice:	182
Benevento	183
Venice	192
Circulating Medium	195
Currency and the Economy	197

SIX	<u>Carolingian Capitularies in Italy</u>	211
	Historiography	211
	Manuscripts	214
	Capitularies in Context	220
	Italian Capitularies: Synoptic Comments	231
	Characterizing Capitularies	233
	The Purpose of the Capitularies	242
	Capitularies and the Carolingians	245
SEVEN	<u>Coda</u>	254
	<i>or instead of a conclusion</i>	
	 Bibliography: Primary Sources	 259
	 Bibliography: Secondary Sources	 262

Acknowledgements

The research for this thesis was conducted in several libraries but especially in the University of London Library in Senate House, where Helen Young in the Palaeography Room was particularly helpful; in the British Libraries, old and new; in the Institute of Historical Research and in the Warburg Institute.

I should like to thank my supervisor Janet Nelson, whose scholarship has been a constant inspiration.

Acknowledgement pages are for those debts which can't just be indicated in footnotes. This is partly because they're not merely academic debts, but mostly because they're worth much more than just a footnote. Alan Scadding first showed me that history could be more than an exam. Guy Halsall, Barrie Singleton and Alan Thacker all provided encouragement at times when it was sorely needed. So too, very generously, did Anke Holdenried, who also demonstrated empirically that the maximum daily intake of caffeine and cigarettes is much higher than I ever imagined.

Andrea Valli, Paolo Grillo and Claire Pilsworth kindly provided me with items which were unavailable in English libraries. Claire also read chapters II and III. Ross Balzaretti read chapters II, III, IV and VI. Both greatly improved the sections they read. I am very grateful to them for their efforts.

My greatest creditors are Paul Kershaw and Sarah Hamilton. They both read pretty much the whole thesis, sometimes repeatedly. Long, fun, hard-fought discussions with Paul taught me an enormous amount about the subject. Knowing him has been one of the best parts of the process. Islington will never be quite the same.

I owe Sarah even more. I've learnt more from her, about more things, than from anybody else. She guided me on important points of technique and so helped remove many errors. More significantly when my morale was at its lowest she guided me out of that too. I owe her a huge amount. I would have fallen by the wayside long ago without her help.

It's an acknowledgements cliché to end with one's family, but then most clichés are true. My parents, my sister and my grandmother have always supported me in every way, with everything from cash to cakes. When they encouraged me to start my PhD, I doubt they realised how much effort *they'd* have to put in. Actually, even if they had known I think they would probably still have told me to do it. Like footnotes, the text wouldn't have been finished without them and, just like footnotes, the viability of the whole thing depended on them. It may not always have seemed like it but I *did* notice; and I am very grateful. *Possiamo smettere adesso.*

Abbreviations

<i>AB</i>	<i>Annales Bertiniani</i> , ed. G. Waitz, <i>MGH Ex Usum Scholarum</i> , (Hannover, 1883).
<i>Archiv</i>	<i>Archiv der Gesellschaft für ältere deutsche Geschichtskunde</i> , (Hannover).
<i>ARF</i>	<i>Annales Regni Francorum</i> , eds. G. Pertz & F. Kurze, <i>MGH Ex Usum Scholarum</i> , (Hannover, 1895).
<i>ASL</i>	<i>Archivio Storico Lombardo</i> , (Amsterdam).
<i>ASP...</i>	<i>Archivio Storico per le Province...</i> [+ name of region/city]
<i>BISI</i>	<i>Bolletino dell'Istituto Storico Italiano</i> , (Rome).
<i>BMZ</i>	Böhmer-Muhlbacher, <i>Regesten</i> , vol. III <i>Die Regesten des Regnum Italiae und der Burgundischer Teil: die Karolinger im Regnum Italiae 840-887 (888)</i> , ed. H. Zielinski, (Vienna, Cologne, 1991).
Calasso, <i>MED</i>	F. Calasso, <i>Medio Evo del Diritto</i> , (Milan, 1954).
<i>CB</i>	<i>Chronicon Brixienne</i> , ed. G. Pertz, <i>MGH SS III</i> , pp. 238-40.
<i>CDL</i>	<i>Codice Diplomatico Longobardo</i> , ed. L. Schiaparelli, 2 vols. (<i>FSI</i> 62 (1929), 63 (1933); Rome).
<i>CNI</i>	<i>Corpus Nummorum Italicorum: Primo Tentativo di un Catalogo Generale delle Monete Medievali e Moderne Coniate in Italia o da Italiani in Altri Paesi</i> . (Milan, 1912-).
<i>CSBC</i>	<i>Chronicon Sancti Benedicti Casinensis</i> , ed. G. Waitz, <i>MGH SS RL</i> , pp. 468-82.
<i>DA</i>	<i>Deutsches Archiv für Erforschung des Mittelalter</i> , (Cologne).
<i>DBI</i>	<i>Dizionario Biografico degli Italiani</i> , multiple vols., (Rome, 1960-).
Einhard, <i>VKM</i>	Einhard, <i>Vita Karoli Magni</i> , ed. O. Holder-Egger, <i>MGH Ex Usum Scholarum</i> , (Hannover, Leipzig, 1911)..
<i>FS</i>	<i>Frühmittelalterliche Studien</i> . (Jahrbuch des Instituts für Frühmittelalterlicherforschung des Universität Münster; Berlin, New York).

- FSI* *Fonti per la Storia d'Italia* (published by Istituto Italiano per il Medio Evo; Rome).
- GEN* *Johannes Diaconus, Gesta Episcoporum Neapolitanorum*, ed. G. Waitz, *MGH SS RL*, pp. 402-36.
- Grierson & Blackburn, *MEC* P. Grierson & M. Blackburn, *Medieval European Coinage*, vol. I, *The Early Middle Ages*, (Cambridge, 1986).
- HLCG* *Historia Langobardorum Codicis Gothani*, ed. G. Waitz, *MGH SS RL*, pp. 7-11.
- IMU* *Italia Medievale e Umanistica*, (Padova).
- KG* *Karl der Grosse. Lebenswerk und Nachleben*, ed. W. Braunfels & H. Beumann, 5 vols. (Dusseldorf, 1966).
- Löwe, *DG* Wattenbach Levison, ed. H. Löwe, *Deutschlands Geschichtsquellen*, 4 vols., (Weimar, 1952-63).
- LP* *Liber Pontificalis*, ed. L. Duchesne, 3 vols., (Paris, 1886-92).
- MGH* *Monumenta Germaniae Historica*.
- MGH Cap* *ibid. Capitularia Regum Francorum*, tom. I ed. A. Boretius, (Hannover, 1883); tom. II eds. A. Boretius & V. Krause, (Hannover, 1897).
- MGH DK* *MGH Diplomata Karolinorum I: Pippini, Carlomanni, Carolomagni Diplomata*, ed. E. Mühlbacher, (Hannover, 1906).
- DLo* *MGH Diplomata Karolinorum III: Die Urkunden Lothars I und Lothars II*, ed. T. Schieffer, (Berlin, 1966).
- DLII* *Ludovici II Diplomata*, ed. K. Wanner, *FSI Antiquitates* 3 (Rome, 1994).
- MGH Ep* *ibid. Epistolae Karolini Aevi*, t.II ed. E. Duemmler, (Berlin, 1895); vol.IV (Berlin, 1925); *Epistolarum VII Epistolae Karolini Aevi* vol. V (Berlin, 1928).
- MGH PLAC* *ibid. Poetae Latini Aevi Carolini*, vol. I ed. E. Duemmler, (Berlin, 1881); vol. III.1 ed. L. Traube, (Berlin, 1886); vol. III.2 ed. L. Traube, (Berlin, 1892); vol. IV ed. K. Strecker (Berlin, 1923).
- MGH SS* *ibid. Scriptorum*, 34 vols., (Hannover, 1826-).

<i>MGH SS RL</i>	<i>ibid. Scriptores Rerum Langobardicarum et Italicarum</i> , ed. G. Waitz, (Hannover, 1878).
Morrison & Grunthal, <i>CC</i>	K. F. Morrison & H. Grunthal, <i>Carolingian Coinage</i> , (Numismatic Notes and Monographs, American Numismatic Society, no. 158; 1967).
<i>MIÖG</i>	<i>Mitteilungen des Instituts für Österreichische Geschichtsforschung</i> , (Vienna, Cologne, Graz).
Muratori <i>A</i>	<i>Antiquitates</i> .
Muratori <i>SRI</i>	<i>Scriptores Rerum Italicarum</i> .
<i>NC</i>	<i>Numismatic Chronicle</i> , (British Numismatic Society, London).
<i>PBSR</i>	<i>Papers of the British School at Rome</i> , (London).
<i>PL</i>	<i>Patrologiae cursus completus, series Latina</i> , 221 vols., ed. J-P. Migne, (1844-63).
<i>QF</i>	<i>Quellen und Forschungen aus Italienischen Archiven und Bibliotheken</i> , (Deutsches Historisches Institut Rom; Tübingen).
<i>Revue Belge</i>	<i>Revue Belge de Philologie et d'Histoire</i> , (Société pour le progrès des Études Philologiques et Historiques; Brussels).
<i>RSCI</i>	<i>Rivista di Storia della Chiesa in Italia</i> , (Rome).
<i>RSI</i>	<i>Rivista Storica Italiana</i> , (Naples).
<i>S</i> [+town name]	<i>Storia di...</i> [e.g. <i>SMilano</i> = <i>Storia di Milano</i>].
<i>SM</i>	<i>Studi Medievali</i> , (Torino).
<i>SSpol</i>	<i>Settimana di Studio del Centro Italiano di Studi sull'Alto Medioevo</i> , <i>Spoleto</i> , (Spoleto).

I

Introduction

The purpose of this thesis is best explained by considering the historiography of early medieval Italy thus delineating the historiographical 'gap' this study is intended to partly fill.

Defining the Field - Historiography: the concept of *Italia* of course greatly predates even the period treated here. Most modern Italian politicians are keen to stress Italy's status as a nation-state, but in fact this entity is a relatively recent creation. Before 1860 peninsular Italy existed as a self-contained unified polity only for about six decades of Ostrogothic rule. When Metternich uttered his famous maxim that Italy is a geographical expression precedent was overwhelmingly on his side.

Much of the historiography written by Italian historians since the Risorgimento, particularly until the Second World War, can be seen as an attempt to address the perceived need for a 'national' history comparable to that of other Western states. Unfortunately political history could not supply the dominant theme for this Italian national history,¹ as it did for other Western states. Contemporary England, France or even Spain could appeal to ongoing political traditions. Their concept of nationhood was inspired by continuing the existence of the current nation-state whose origins, it was believed, could be traced back hundreds of years. In the cases of England and France this history also included seminal roles for barbarian immigrants who even gave their name to the countries thus created. But in Italy the whole point was that the nation-state was newly-minted. The nearest parallel to Italy was Germany which however looked back to the medieval German empire underlain by a concept of ethnic, indeed racial, fellowship. There was neither a political unit in Italy's past comparable to the German Empire nor any convenient fiction of a common racial origin for the peoples of Italy. Muratori wrote in the

¹Noted by C. Wickham, *Early Medieval Italy. Central Power and Local Society 400-1000*, (London, 1981), pp. 1-5. Cf. also D. A. Bullough, *Italy and Her Invaders*, (Inaugural Lecture, University of Nottingham, 1968), pp. 5-6.

hope of creating 'Italy' but neither he nor Risorgimento figures ever adopted Ostrogothic Italy as their model.²

The problem was that peninsular Italy did not have a history as a whole. Compilations of sources reveal something of the dilemma. Muratori's pioneering eighteenth-century editions had explicitly Italian titles: *Rerum Italicarum Scriptores* and *Antiquitates Italicae Medii Aevi*.³ There was no mention of Germanic interlopers such as the Lombards (although works from the Lombard era were of course included). It is no accident that the *Scriptores Rerum Langobardicarum* was produced by German editors⁴ nor that the greatest early attempt at a narrative was written by another German scholar, Ludwig Hartmann.⁵ Indeed it is an axiom that the *Annali d'Italia*⁶, a year-by-year narrative, was Muratori's effort to write 'the history of the Italian peninsula as a unified whole' and that this failed: 'his analytical approach seems to be used to hide the absence of a central theme.'⁷ In the terms of Enlightenment historiography the central theme should have been political.

However, since no political history of Italy could be used as a template for Italian nationhood a different solution to the problem of creating a national history was adopted. It emphasised Italian cultural achievement as the constant of Italy's history. Italy therefore became the home of Latin antiquity and the Renaissance. This still left the centuries between the Fall of Rome and the Duecento rather isolated. So for the medieval era the emphasis was laid on a different cultural artefact - law. In Italian-language studies juridical works provided the thread binding together Italian history from imperial legislation through the barbarized Lombard laws to the jurists of the eleventh and twelfth centuries and the establishment of the Bologna law schools. This strand of Italian historiography is

²Cf again the comments in Wickham, *Early Medieval Italy*, pp. 1-2.

³*AI* (6 vols., 1728-32); *RSI*, (28 vols. 1723-51). The huge second edition of *RIS* (Bologna, 1900-) involves new editions of many works.

⁴*Monumenta Germaniae Historica, Scriptores Rerum Langobardicarum*, ed. G. Waitz, (Hannover, 1878).

⁵L. M. Hartmann, *Geschichte Italiens im Mittelalter*, 4 vols. (Gotha, 1900-23).

⁶*Annali d'Italia*, (12 vols. 1744-9).

⁷'Muratori', *Encyclopedia Britannica* VII (1983), p. 108.

still very influential today although less obviously so than in the past. I shall return to this below.

If juridical history came to be the thread holding together Italian historiography it was nevertheless certainly not the only type of history being written. Historical writing about Italy has traditionally oscillated between two historiographical idealizations: Imperial Rome and the communes, which one might somewhat more inaccurately characterize as the Empire and the Renaissance. The reasons for this bipolar history are easy to discern. The emphasis on the communes is partly the result of that extremely powerful Italian local sentiment, or *campanilismo*, which Anglo-Saxon observers especially find so unfamiliar. The influence of Antiquity on Europe's intellectual development scarcely needs comment. However in history rather than historiography, a period of at least five hundred years separated the end of Empire from the formal rise of the communes. The century covered by this thesis falls within this span.

It was, and to some extent still is, a particularly difficult period to fit into the historiographical pattern of Italy's development because its major political unit, the *regnum Langobardorum*, and its Carolingian successor the *regnum Italiae* covered about forty percent of the peninsula (and sometimes more when Spoleto and Benevento were added). This was obviously too large to be a commune but too small and 'barbarian' to be 'Imperial'. In this sense the early medieval north Italian polity might have been something of an embarrassment to historians trying to write a peninsular history because there was thus a substantial political unit covering a substantial period of time which inconveniently fitted neither Italy's historiography nor the Risorgimento national project. Its lengthy historical existence pointed to a possible alternative political project. This model was, however, ignored in the historiography since the lineaments of Italian history were largely determined by the kind of historians who wrote, who concentrated on the regional aspects of the history of this era. Often the 'barbarians' and their polities were simply missed out.

One of the few Italian historians to consider some of the questions of the development of political units in Italy was Sestan. In 1950 he argued that the development of a concept of unity for early medieval Italy was 'arduo, anzi vano' and he characterized it as a 'pseudo-problema'.

Se è arduo, anzi vano, cercare un fondamento logico al problema, o pseudo-problema, dell'unità della storia Italiana, non perciò si vuol negare l'evidenza che questo problema tuttavia si è posto e continuerà...a porre: che si continuerà a scrivere storie d'Italia che sono, in realtà, giustapposizione, più o meno abilmente coperta e fusa, di eventi politici, sociali, economici, religiosi, ecc prodottosi nell'Italia geografica.

This characterization was certainly valid in 1950 and to a considerable extent still is. Progress, Sestan suggested, would depend on understanding the development of modern Italian unity from its regional building blocks but, even more, from understanding the constant political flux which was Italian history. Italian history before 1860 had to be understood as

il confluire e dissolversi in un unità politica delle storie degli stati particolari sulla base di un comune coscienza nazionale e di una comune cultura letteraria e in sede culturale, sulla base anche proprio di questo mito storiografico dell'unità, di una unità di memorie e di una fraternità di destini da Roma ad oggi.⁸

At least a part of Sestan's predictions have unfolded although perhaps not in the manner which he expected. Over the last generation Italian historiography has been dominated intellectually by two scholars: Pierre Toubert and Giovanni Tabacco. Both published hugely-influential works in 1973⁹ and although it would be rather an exaggeration to claim that modern Italian historical writing began after that date it is

⁸E. Sestan, 'Per la Storia di un'Idea Storiografica: l'Idea di una Unità della Storia Italiana', *RSI* 62 (1950), pp. 180-98, at 197-8.

⁹P. Toubert, *Les Structures du Latium Médiéval. Le Latium méridional et la Sabine du IX^e à la fin du XII^e siècle*, 2 vols. (Rome, 1973); G. Tabacco, *Egemonie Sociali e Strutture del Potere nel Medioevo Italiano*, (Turin, 1973), now in English transl. as *The Struggle for Power in Medieval Italy: Structures of Political Rule*, (Cambridge, 1989).

certainly fair to say that almost literally every historian working in the field since then has owed Toubert and Tabacco some kind of intellectual debt, often a major one. Neither work emerged from a vacuum. Bogneri¹⁰ and Violante¹¹ for example had both already produced important studies, albeit of very different types. Bogneri tended to take an excessively partisan view of Lombard history and many of his assumptions about Lombard ethnicity and influence are now questionable. Violante on the other hand in his 1953 monograph (purportedly about Milanese society but actually ranging much more-widely across broad economic and social problems) provides a pre-echo of the dominance of Marxist (or 'marxisant') historians. Violante's book is an interesting example of the predominance of regional concepts of history which in some regards almost amounts to a historiographical reflex. The regional approach has a long history (and historiography) in Italy. Indeed by the time Toubert and Tabacco completed their template many Italian towns had commissioned lavish multi-author histories - the various *Storie di...* (the reader should add the name of a city).¹² There has been no slackening of the tide since 1973; those towns without such bibliographic symbols of civic pride have busily continued to have them produced.¹³ The success of Toubert's *Structures du Latium Médiéval* is therefore perhaps easier to understand. It is an intense regional study and, for all of its innovations, it can be fitted into the regional tradition of Italian historiography. In this sense Toubert worked with the grain of the historiography by prioritizing the local over the peninsular. Moreover for international readers, it offered a methodology which might be adapted to environments other than Italy. That Toubert emerged from the Annales school and was clearly indebted to Duby may also have helped to increase the (well-

¹⁰G. P. Bogneri's *L'Età Longobarda*, (Milan, 1963, 4 vols.) is a massive collection of his works.

¹¹C. Violante, *La società Milanese nell'età Precomunale*, (Istituto Italiano per gli studi Storici in Napoli, 4; Bari, 1953; 2nd edn. Bari, 1974).

¹²Such works are very numerous and of varying quality, ranging from the excellent to the antiquarian, often in the same volume. I have certainly not attempted to provide a comprehensive list: those used for this study are listed in the bibliography under *Storia di...* and probably represent as typical a sample as those selected by any other criteria.

¹³E.g. *Storia di Ravenna* (Ravenna, 1992); *Storia di Venezia. Dalle Origini alla Caduta della Repubblica*, 3 vols. (Rome, 1992).

deserved) reputation enjoyed by this work. Italian historiography has often shown an almost excessive respect for foreign intellectual traditions. Further, there were analogies to Toubert's position; even in the nineteenth century foreign scholars, usually German, had made much of the historiographical running.

Tabacco's work on the other hand was very different. Its impact derived in part from the fact that it was the culmination and summation of a series of studies which he had published between 1966-73.¹⁴ These works dealt with the relationship between status and landholding and its social and political effects. His great 1973 work continued this approach but on a grander scale. It was explicitly *not* another regional study. The success of Tabacco's approach derived from its combination of two distinct historiographical traditions

Italian historiography, as I indicated above, was heavily-influenced by juridical history. For long periods juridical sources are our only way of approaching the institutions of government; however although this juridical history *implied* much about the early medieval 'state' these implications remained largely unexplored either because the historians involved were legal rather than politico-institutional scholars or because the prevailing historiography dismissed the early middle ages as 'barbarous'. Tabacco achieved a happy fusion by using the juridical approach to Italian history to illuminate the socio-economic effects of the institutions of government and hence the development of these institutions. Tabacco has called his approach 'socio-political'¹⁵ but since his understanding of politics is based around the control of political structures, and he sees these as determined by the institutions via which political power

¹⁴G. Tabacco, *I Liberi del Re nell'Italia Carolingia e Post-Carolingia*, (Spoleto, 1966); idem. 'Dai Possessori dell'età Carolingia agli esercitanti dell'età Longobarda', *SM* ser. 3, X.1 (1969), pp. 221-68; idem. 'La connessione fra potere e possesso nel regno Longobardo e nel regno Franco', *I Problemi del Occidente nel secolo VIII* (SSpol XX, 1973), pp. 133-68.

¹⁵Tabacco, *Struggle for Power in Medieval Italy*, p. 1 (This introduction is available only in the 1989 English translation).

operates, it might more accurately be called 'socio-institutional'. (Since Tabacco is relatively uninterested in the small change of 'event-based' political historical narrative I feel this is a reasonable characterization.) This analysis was especially effective for the early middle ages. The framework Tabacco set out for this period has never been challenged since, nor even much modified. In the most important recent synthesis of Lombard and Carolingian history Delogu has superbly summarized developments in the field since 1973.¹⁶ It is very noteworthy that Delogu, generally one of the most distinctive historians to work in the area, still basically follows Tabacco's outline.

Toubert and Tabacco are the two poles around which most subsequent historical writing about Italy has moved. They are indeed complementary since they use similar methodologies. Tabacco's work provides the broad framework of macro-development while Toubert provides the model for local studies which can be fitted into Tabacco's overview. If regional studies provide analyses which conflict with Toubert's conclusions this is no problem since regional variation is to be expected. What one might slightly disrespectfully dub the Toubert-Tabacco axis therefore provided both a methodology (Toubert) and a framework to give regional analyses context and meaning (Tabacco). This desire to thus contextualize regional studies shows clearly that such regional works, no matter how well-executed, do not entirely satisfy their authors. More recently the authors of regional studies have become increasingly concerned with contextualizing their work at a European level.¹⁷ At the risk of being accused of being excessively Anglo-Saxon in my outlook, this perhaps indicates that even today Italian historians subconsciously hanker after writing a wider history than the 'campanilistico' model permits. The Sisyphean

¹⁶P. Delogu, 'Lombard and Carolingian Italy, *New Cambridge Medieval History*, ed. R. McKitterick, (Cambridge, 1995), vol. II, ch. 12, pp. 290-319.

¹⁷Cf. e.g. R. Strassoldo's review of H. Krahwinkler, *Friaul im Frühmittelalter: Geschichte einer Region vom Ende des fünften bis zum ende des zehnte Jahrhunderts*, (Veröffentlichungen des Instituts für Österreichische Geschichtsforschung XXX; Vienna, Cologne, 1992) in *Studi Goriziani* 77 (1993), pp. 126-7.

chimera remains that kind of grand Italian 'national' history which for at least two generations has been widely accepted to be impossible.

Toubert-Tabacco has proved to be an historiographical model both flexible enough to absorb widely differing approaches and prescriptive enough to create a certain homogeneity in later works because the influence of these two scholars has caused much of the subsequent historiography to concentrate on similar fields and methods. (This applies especially but not exclusively to studies by Italian and French scholars - the latter often students of Toubert.)¹⁸ Dense regional studies based above all on cartularies and using Tabacco's socio-institutional analysis as a framework have presented a sophisticated picture of Italian early medieval history as the interaction of very local forces with state institutions or their representatives. Such regional studies predominate in the historiography, rather as regional studies always have in Italy. In this sense Toubert is therefore perhaps even more directly influential than Tabacco. This is not only true of Italian and French scholars however. Given the historiographical hegemony of regional studies in some senses almost all those who work in the field are honorary Italians. The work of Anglophone historians of early medieval Italy, for example, is almost all at least in origin based on the study of one particular town or region: Wickham on Tuscany,¹⁹ T. S. Brown on Ravenna,²⁰ Balzaretti on Milan,²¹ Skinner on Gaeta,²² even, in a sense, Noble on Rome.²³ To be sure most of them have moved on to deal with broader topics such as the end of the ancient world (Wickham)²⁴ or Byzantine Italy generally (Brown)²⁵ or monasticism (Balzaretti). However this next step has almost always been taken from the

¹⁸Particularly significant in this regard is the French scholarship published by the École Française de Rome: J-M. Martin, *La Pouille du VIe aux XIIe siècle*, (1993); H. Taviani-Carozzi, *La Principauté de Salerne IXe-XIe siècle*, (1991); F. Menant, *Campagnes Lombardes du Moyen Age: l'Economie et la Société Rurale dans la Région de Bergame, de Crémone et de Brescia du Xe au XIIIe siècle*, (1993).

¹⁹*The Mountains and the City*, (Oxford, 1994) cit.

²⁰T. S. Brown, *Gentlemen and Officers*, (British School at Rome, 1984).

²¹*The Lands of S Ambrogio*, (unpublished PhD, University of London, 1989).

²²P. Skinner, *Family Power in Early Medieval Gaeta*, (Cambridge, 1995).

²³T. F. X. Noble, *The Republic of St. Peter 680-824*, (Philadelphia, 1984).

²⁴See esp. chs. 1, 3, 4 in his collected essays *Land and Power*, (British School at Rome, 1993).

²⁵E.g. his chapter in *New Cambridge Medieval History*, ed. R. McKitterick, (Cambridge, 1994).

sure foundation of local studies. In their emphasis on regional history, for once, British historians are not unusual.²⁶ Cultural, and more narrowly, ideological history have been almost wholly absent from this work. Essentially this thesis hopes to fill this gap.

It would certainly be untrue to say that the post-1973 historiography of early medieval Italy has completely ignored cultural and ideological questions. Tabacco and his disciples allude to the topic, Tabacco in particular with great subtlety but little detail. However it is generally taken as a given. Conversely, a handful of scholars, such as Mirella Ferrari or Simona Gavinelli, have worked on culture, in the sense of intellectual history, via palaeography - but they have generally been uninterested in its political aspects, or at least (since they have only now begun to undertake much of the basic work earlier generations left undone) unable to link wider intellectual historical questions to political ones because of the demands and problems of the evidence with which they are dealing. Likewise art historians have published many works but have generally been uninterested in the, admittedly often marginal, ideological sub-text of the pieces considered. At the risk of reducing the field to caricature one might say that 'normal' historians have generally written regional socio-institutional studies, historians of intellectual life have concentrated on narrower themes (often individual scriptoria or manuscripts) while art-historians have concentrated on questions of aesthetics and style rather than political or ideological content.

Likewise, just as intellectual history has not been entirely dormant nor has political history. In the 1960s while Toubert and Tabacco were working out the details of their interpretations, German-language scholars continued to produce studies of various aspects of Italian political history: Hlawitschka's prosopographical studies;²⁷ Fischer's study of the

²⁶Cf e.g. in German scholarship cf. H. Schwarzmaier, *Lucca und das Reich bis zum Ende des 11. Jahrhunderts*, (Tübingen, 1972); J. Jarnut, *Bergamo 568-1098: Verfassungs-, sozial- und wirtschaftsgeschichte eine lombardischer Stadt im Mittelalter*, (Wiesbaden, 1980).

²⁷E. Hlawitschka, *Franken, Alemannen, Bayern und Burgunder im Oberitalien (774-962)*, (Forschungen zur Oberrheinischen Landesgeschichte Bd. VIII; Freiburg, 1960); 'Die Widonen im Dukat von Spoleto' *QF* 63 (1983), pp. 20-92; 'Die Politischen Intentionen der Widonen im Dukat von Spoleto', *Atti del 9° Congresso Internazionale di Studi sull'Alto Medioevo*, (Spoleto, 1983), pp. 123-47.

relationship between the monarchy, the aristocracy and the Church;²⁸ Schmid's consideration of the political end of the Lombard kingdom;²⁹ Keller's analysis of the personnel of government and more recently Jarnut's old-fashioned but important reinterpretations of 'great events'³⁰ are all significant and useful studies - but all ignore ideology. Furthermore it is striking that with the exception of Jarnut's works these analyses almost all appeared before 1975, which is to say before the Toubert-Tabacco synthesis achieved pre-eminence. This pre-eminence survives to this day.

However despite all this work, not only has the Toubert-Tabacco interpretation remained dominant but, furthermore, an 'Italian history' remains just as elusive as it did for Sestan nearly fifty years ago. Indeed the existence of the Toubert-Tabacco orthodoxy might be thought to have contributed to the end of such a project. It seems to have led to the abandonment of any authentic attempt to even write such a history. The difference is that we are now in possession of many of those regional histories which Sestan rightly believed to be the next step. However rather than opening up a new path they appear to have stymied the project entirely. Capitani acknowledged in 1979 the absence of 'una vera storia universale in area italica' and suggested this derived from the absence of 'un'ideologia totalizzante',³¹ although it is rather unclear whether he considered this ideology missing from the early middle ages or the late twentieth century. Ten years later even Tabacco, the scholar who, whether deliberately or not, perhaps came nearest to that fusion of political, social, economic and religious events which Sestan had mused over, concluded that intensive study had 'revealed in man a plurality which cannot be summarized in a unifying structure'. As a philosophical point this is of course undeniable. In practical terms, it meant that

²⁸J. Fischer, *Königtum, Adel und Kirche im Königreich Italien 774-875*, (Habelts Dissertationsdrücke Reihe Mittelalterliche Geschichte, Hft. 1; Bonn, 1965).

²⁹K. Schmid, 'Zur Ablösung der Langobardenherrschaft durch die Franken', *QF* 52 (1972), pp. 1-35.

³⁰J. Jarnut, 'König Bernhard von Italien: Der Versuch einer Rehabilitierung', *SM* 30.2 (1989), pp. 636-48.

³¹O. Capitani, 'La Storiografia altomedievale: linee di emergenza della critica contemporanea,' *Annali dell'Istituto Italo-Germanico di Trento* V (1979), pp. 209-34, at 232.

'it has now become possible to present the Italian Middle Ages in contrapuntal form between north and south. We will play on this contrapuntal theme to make one history of Italy out of the two histories which in the Middle Ages attracted to themselves the most vigorous European forces and today attract the interest of the most vigorous historical writing.'³² Although Tabacco presented it as the opening up of a new possibility, implicitly the very idea of writing a 'history of Italy' was acknowledged to be dead. I am certainly not going to attempt any such thing even were it possible.

Whence derives the impossibility of writing an 'Italian' history ? The obvious answer is that it is encoded Sestan's 'fraternity of destinies' - in the very fact that we have a set of extremely disparate Italian histories rather than a central interpretation around which to group them. How this mass of local histories replaced any convincing unitary historiography is therefore in its turn central to the question. The impossibility of writing a unified history hinges on the general agreement that northern Italy, especially, underwent some kind of governmental crisis c. 900. This crisis is the key event of early medieval Italian history, indeed from some perspectives it might be considered the key event of all Italian history. It put paid to the *regnum Langobardorum* as a political unit. Tabacco characterized the result as 'political anarchy',³³ Wickham as 'the failure of the state', although he modified this view by emphasizing that the state as a bureaucratic entity continued to function in the tenth century at a local level. In this regard the crisis c. 900 was more a localization of the state than its collapse, the devolution of state functions to a lower level. Since 'the state' didn't collapse, however, the fundamental nature of the crisis is therefore a withdrawal of consent from the Italian polity by the political elite - hence the characterization of the tenth century as marking a crisis of authority and thus the loss of 'royal hegemony'.³⁴ The crisis was then pre-eminently an ideological one, which Wickham at least casts in terms of the state ideology's loss of 'relevance'. However the lineaments of

³²Tabacco, *Struggle*, p. 36 (English intro.).

³³Tabacco, *Struggle*, ch. 4.

³⁴Wickham, *Early Medieval Italy*, chs. 5, 7, esp. pp. 140f, 176.

this ideology have never actually been described. The purpose of this thesis is to at least partly fill this gap. What was the ideology of Carolingian rulership in Italy ? Even more importantly how was it perceived by those at whom it was aimed ?

An assumption underlies my approach. It is that there once existed within the *regnum Langobardorum* an idea of 'the 'community of the realm'. I am willing to have this presumption disproved (although this would then present the question of how it was that this kingdom survived successfully for three centuries). As Reynolds has emphasized with great clarity,

the fundamental premise of nationalist ideas is that nations are objective realities, existing through history...[this implies that there were] 'predestined 'nation-states'...any past unit of government which no-one claims to be a nation now is *ipso facto* seen as having been less naturally cohesive in the past. It evidently did not enjoy the manifest destiny to solidarity and survival which is the essential attribute of the true nation.³⁵

This exactly describes the current historiographical status of the *regnum Langobardorum*. Modern historiography is still seeking to create either an Italian historiography or a regional one. Even the recent rise of a political party explicitly committed to the secession of an area with almost exactly the same bounds as the early medieval north Italian kingdom has not rescued the *regnum* from its neglect (the Lega Nord has resorted to an artificial 'Padania' rather than seeking an historical predecessor). Yet the kingdom of the Lombards existed for some three hundred years. It did not however give rise to a successor state as, in some sense, did East and West Frankia and Anglo-Saxon England. It has therefore often been assumed that its internal political bonds were weak.³⁶ If the existence of a 'successful' kingdom is above all predicated on the acceptance of a concept of that state one can surely ask why the Italian kingdom was

³⁵S. Reynolds, *Kingdoms and Communities in Western Europe 900-1300*, (Oxford, 1985), pp. 250-6, quotation from 251-2.

³⁶Such an opinion is explicit for example, in D. Harrison, *The Early Medieval State and the Towns*, (Lund, 1994) who characterizes the Lombard state as 'weak'.

different from its West European contemporaries. The idea of the Lombard kingdom might have been exclusively ethnic; this was certainly the belief of an older generation of historians. 774 saw the replacement of a Lombard aristocracy by a predominantly ethnically Frankish or Aleman one. Yet the *regnum langobardorum* survived for a century after 774. If one thinks this is merely attributable to the 'momentum' of the political unit conquered in 774 one must acknowledge that such momentum must have been very considerable.

Problems, Limits, Aims: In all of the historiographical approaches considered above ideology has been largely ignored. This omission is not only because the prevailing historiographical trends have moved in other directions. On the face of it Carolingian ideology in north Italy is an unpromising subject. The central fact of ninth-century north Italian history (indeed of the period 600-900) is the lack of any substantial sources written close to the royal court. There is no Italian equivalent to the *Annales Regni Francorum* or Einhard's *Life of Charlemagne*. Our perceptions of the Carolingians in Italy are therefore almost all peripheral views of the centre from the margins. The material is widely scattered. Simply defining a corpus of it is difficult. Deciding which criteria to use can expand the field to include almost all early medieval sources or compress it to nothing. Carolingian influence was felt very widely throughout the peninsula even in regions not directly controlled by the Carolingians. This was particularly true in the reigns of Charlemagne and Louis II. Representations of the Carolingians produced by 'Italians' (or at least within the peninsula) are therefore surprisingly numerous even outside the *regnum Italiae*. Such sources, written in a somewhat a different cultural environment, increase the variety of our evidence and enrich the picture we can develop; however they certainly do not simplify the problems associated with understanding the representation of the Carolingians in Italy. The absence of sources directly and explicitly representing court opinions therefore requires a different approach from that appropriate in, say, West Frankia.

But in order to go further one must attempt some definitions and hence consider some theories. For the purposes of this thesis 'ideology' cannot be considered to be a coherent set of ideas justifying a particular political attitude or system. No such expression of Carolingian rule is known from Italy³⁷ in this period, nor for Lombard rule come to that. However government continued to function throughout this period and clearly won some sort of consent from those involved with it. (It was my hope to be able to deal with the breakdown of that consent in the late ninth century but this proved beyond my scope.) Whether anyone ever considered the purpose of government in the *regnum Italiae* in this period and sought to formulate a coherent justification for its operation is not known. If such a work ever existed no traces survive; there seems to have been no Italian Alcuin or Hincmar.

On the other hand what was clearly present was an acceptance of government and of its control by the Carolingians. This generally seems to have been uncontentious. It does not seem to have been an articulated acceptance of the new regime but rather an acceptance of the continuation of those structures which already existed. In this regard it is often held that 774 changed relatively little. I have therefore chosen to concentrate on the image of the Carolingians in all this because their supplanting of the Lombard kings was one of the few aspects of government we can be certain *did* change as a result of the Frankish conquest of northern Italy. Thus although there was no conscious expression of 'ideology' in the modern sense, acceptance seems to have been widespread. Between 776 and 880 although there were a handful of aristocratic rebellions³⁸ (and one major revolt in 817) there was no attempt to replace the Carolingians with another dynasty or to drive out the

³⁷Nor according to some from anywhere else in the Carolingian period: K. F. Morrison, *The Two Kingdoms. Ecclesiology in Carolingian Political Thought*, (Princeton, 1964) pp. 10-11 n. 14 dismisses Alcuin and Hincmar's writings too.

³⁸Although nothing like as many as are known from north of the Alps: see K. Brunner, *Oppositionelle Gruppen im Karolingerreich*, (Veröffentlichungen des Instituts für Österreichische Geschichtsforschung, bd. XXV; Vienna - Cologne - Graz, 1979) for an overview. To my knowledge between 774-875 there are only three aristocratic rebellions which are not demonstrably linked to the monarchy: Rotgaud of Friuli's 'Lombard nationalist' revolt in 776, 'the revolt of the two Lamberts' c.860 and the unusual case of Louis II's imprisonment in 871.

Franks. Even 817, which split the ruling elite, was caused by tensions concerning *which* Carolingian would rule Italy, not *whether* a Carolingian would do so.³⁹

It may be possible to turn this inarticulate acceptance to advantage. Precisely because the sources considered in this thesis were not designed as sophisticated 'ideological' expressions of Carolingian power theirs is a marginal representation of the Carolingians. These images were not the centrepiece of the works which contained them. They were therefore probably less subject to 'spin-doctoring' than official representations. They provide evidence of unconscious attitudes to the Carolingians. Therefore we may find not only the familiar image of the Carolingians propagated by court sources but also get some idea of how it was perceived.

In many ways Carolingian self-representation can be considered quite a formal and rigid mask - almost the abstraction of power. The purpose of this thesis is *not* to get behind this mask but rather to consider its features and the reaction to them. The implicit assumption underlying other historians' work has been that behind this mask lay the 'real' face of Carolingian government. On the contrary I would argue that if ideology in any sense brought about the acceptance of Carolingian authority then the image of that authority was vitally important to government. In the provinces where they were inevitably absent from most places at most times⁴⁰ it was not the Carolingians themselves but the *idea* of them which compelled obedience. Indeed in this sense the mask does not hide Carolingian government - most of the time it *is* Carolingian government. Hence understanding the nature of the mask is very important in order to understand Carolingian government.

Obviously to define it as a sort of tacit acceptance makes ideology more like a form of *mentalité*, an elusive subject to approach via the sources we possess for this period. I have therefore begun with the intention of examining all the media which carried the image of Carolingians, whether put there on Carolingian orders or not. This includes not only the

³⁹Thus T. F. X. Noble, 'The Revolt of Bernard of Italy', *SM* 15 (1974), pp. 315-26; cf Delogu, 'Lombard and Carolingian Italy', pp. 303f.

⁴⁰Consider Louis the Pious who visited Italy only once in his twenty-six year reign, in 817.

narrative sources which are a traditional first resort of the historian, but also poetry, charters, coins, and capitularies. In the rest of this study I have tried to follow the profile of the evidence as closely as possible by which I mean not only sticking to what the sources say but considering the gaps in the record around the surviving material. Our image of the representation of the Carolingians is undoubtedly very incomplete not least because our evidence is so. When considering many of these sources we finish up examining Carolingian propaganda, or rather the vehicles of that propaganda. This is a very different definition of ideology from the complex sets of ideas which the term usually signifies. But this is more than just a shift in terminology. Important consequences flow from this for the thesis. The types of sources go a long way towards defining the problems which need to be solved. As often as not in order to understand the representations of the Carolingians one must resolve problems in the nature of the sources rather than specific difficulties of interpretation. Sometimes we must not ask *what* something meant but *how* it meant. One can put this another way. Occasionally we are able to reach a contemporary's interpretation of a source. This interpretation is sometimes very different from that which we might expect. Beneventan coins for example retained the same format for several centuries but completely changed their ideological meaning.⁴¹ Hence, we cannot presume that even court-produced Carolingian sources were interpreted in the provinces in the way that they were intended to be understood. The gap between signifier and signified, or more prosaically between intention and result, could be alarmingly wide. This gap could be widened if typological traditions intruded. Some sources were produced in accord with longstanding traditions. The representations they conveyed were thus conditioned by precedent as much as by intention. Thus, to repeat the earlier question, how did things mean ?

When dealing with sources not produced by government these typological problems coincide with a more general one: the material for understanding perception and

⁴¹See below ch. V.

representation is often exactly the same piece of evidence. For example evidence for the *representation* of Louis II in Montecassino can be found in the accounts written by Erchempert and the author of the *Chronica Sancti Benedicti Casinensis*;⁴² but the very same words are also our evidence for the *perception* of Louis II in Montecassino. This can make it difficult to distinguish 'input' from 'output' so to speak. The local representation of the Carolingians may have been influenced by official representations - but the evidence for perceptions is the local representation itself; at this point the distinction between the propagator of the image and its observer is collapsed.

Therefore the image of the Carolingians cannot be considered simply a reproduction of images propagated by the court but may be the product of (perhaps unarticulated) decisions made by the local creators of our evidence as to what to include in their representations. Hence these representations have already undergone one sieving process. To some extent this may make the Carolingian 'mask' the product of not only governmental action but also selection at local level of what was acceptable. The mask then becomes not simply a representation of the official but must be seen as the product of dynamic negotiation between the centre and the periphery; it serves to delineate the field of government activity commonly accepted at local level; or at least the field in which locals accepted government could *claim* to act.

There are many omissions from this study because of the limits of time and the complexity of the subjects. I do not conceive of the image of the Carolingians circulating in isolation; I suspect the images considered here were part of an ideological environment in which the representations of other institutions and images competed. The interaction of these representations, at times in competition, at times mutually reinforcing, may provide a truer account of Italian early medieval history. Regrettably I have not had the time to consider this broader context. Hence there are many important omissions: the Papacy is simply too vast a field and requires at least one thesis of its own; the aristocracy of the

⁴²See ch. III.

*regnum Italiae*⁴³ has never been considered from an ideological or representational standpoint, nor synoptically has the ecclesiastical elite. The relationship of representations of the Carolingians to those of the Lombard rulers is another important question only dealt with tangentially below. Whole areas of representation have also been substantially omitted: ritual and liturgy, architectural and figural representations, piety as social leadership and the role of Carolingian women, for example. Furthermore I have no pretensions to completeness. There is much more to be said about the image of the Carolingians in Italy and about many, perhaps most, of the subjects treated in detail in each chapter. If the aim is to consider Carolingian image-building in the context of its historical and contemporary ideological competitors, then an honest assessment is that this thesis probably does no more than to define a part of the field of enquiry. It deals with the problems of *some* of the categories of source material and presents some, probably interim, conclusions. A subtler reading will perhaps emerge from considering the dynamics of those competing ideologies whose existence I hypothesized above. In the meantime this thesis attempts to deal with the operation of just one institution, but probably the most significant one in the *regnum Italiae* in this period - the Carolingian monarchy.

⁴³Hlawitschka, *Franken*, remains the fundamental prosopographical study, although it is limited in certain crucial ways: he defines an 'aristocrat' as a government 'office-holder', an assumption which inevitably produces an account of the aristocracy closely-related to that of the state; for an example of the problems such definitions raise, cf. P. J. Geary, *Phantoms of Remembrance. Memory and Oblivion at the End of the First Millenium*, (Princeton, 1994), p. 184, n. 13.

II

Narrative Sources I - the *Regnum Italiae*

Introduction: These two opening chapters should be considered as a unit. Chapter one deals with north Italian sources, i.e. the perceptions of the Carolingians by those authors writing within the *regnum italiae*. Chapter two deals with those southern sources written in areas which lived cheek-by-jowl with Carolingian power and which sometimes benefited from it, but were outside the Frankish empire, and then concludes with some synthetic comments. The aim is to collect and discuss the references to the Carolingians in Italian narratives from the period of Carolingian domination in Italy. For current purposes this includes texts written within living memory of the Carolingian era, defined as until c. 910. This includes several works written after 888 such as the chronicle of Erchempert of Montecassino and the *Gesta Episcoporum Neapolitanorum*. The justification for this periodization is that after c. 910 few of those alive would have been able to participate in the great events of the 870s, half a century earlier, much less have been major figures. Moreover the authors of texts written after 910 would know the Carolingians only as 'historical' figures. In this regard by the early-tenth century historians were already in the position of modern scholars trying to recover information from documents but without any personal experience of the events in question. The contemporary, or nearly-so, sources bring us into contact with those who lived in an environment directly influenced by Carolingian activity. Indeed some of these authors wrote without the benefit of hindsight, long before the end of the Carolingian dynasty. For them Carolingian power was an ongoing fact of life. Since the main study of this thesis is the impact of Carolingian images and propaganda in Italy and the way it affected politics in the Carolingian era it is the attitude of contemporaries which is most important. Those texts written after 888 conversely offer an opportunity of evaluating some of the explanations for the

Carolingians' decline and the effect that Louis II's expulsion from the south in 871 had on the perception of the Carolingians. The two chapters below will contextualize the representations of the Carolingians in each text. Obviously since one of my main interests is to consider something of the practical political implications of these representations, questions of audience are very important. This seems to me a most difficult problem. I shall reserve most discussion of audience until the end of chapter III. Lastly note that I have had to restrict the scope of these two chapters. Several works written in the era have been omitted because they contain no references to the Carolingians.¹ Likewise because of the difficulty of dating them neither the continuations of Paul the Deacon nor hagiographies have been included except the securely-dated Neapolitan *vita Athanasii*.² Finally despite its obvious importance the Papal *Liber Pontificalis* has been omitted whose representation of the Carolingians could be the subject of a thesis of its own. Furthermore any attempt to deal with the *LP* would require a general reconsideration of Papal relations with the Carolingians - a subject whose scale and complexity certainly place it beyond my scope.

Historia Langobardorum Codicis Gothani (HLCG):³ This short text is potentially perhaps among the most important from Carolingian Italy because it has been attributed to, at least, a court-influenced centre,⁴ on the grounds that it reflects what one would expect to be the official view. As an example of Carolingian propaganda it is very valuable. Like many of the works below it is essentially a short epitome and continuation of Paul the Deacon although it does not specifically describe itself as such. It presents a view of Lombard history from its origins in 'Scandia' to the Carolingian rulers

¹*Constructio Farfensis*, ed. Bethmann, *MGH SS XI*, pp. 523-30.

²Best recent synoptic account of Italian hagiography (and its problems) is W. Berschin, *Biographie und Epochenstil im Mittelalter*, (Stuttgart, 1988) vol. II.

³*MGH SS RL* pp. 7-11, ed. G. Waitz; most recent edition ed. C. Azzara, *Le leggi dei Longobardi. Storia, memoria e diritto di un popolo germanico* (Milan, 1992) pp. 282-9.

⁴Azzara intro. *Leggi* p. xxxv suggests a Frankish monk as author but does not support this claim with any evidence other than that the text is 'pro-Carolingian'.

Charlemagne and Pippin. This is interpreted 'in a Christian key',⁵ tracing the progression of the Lombards from pagan barbarity to a Christian present. Since Paul the Deacon's is not a noticeably Christian interpretation,⁶ the *HLCG* differs from his work; other differences suggest that it may represent a different, but related, historical tradition.⁷ It survives in a single manuscript, now in Gotha, a legal collection probably from mid-tenth century Mainz.⁸ Although this manuscript is partly derived from Eberhard of Friuli's law-book⁹ it seems unlikely that the *HLCG* was part of Eberhard's book for a number of reasons set out below.

The *HLCG* was apparently written between 807 and the death in 810 of Pippin of Italy, Charlemagne's son, established as *rex Langobardorum* from 781.¹⁰ In addition to its distinctive approach to the Lombard past it includes details concerning Lombard history not recorded elsewhere, such as the pre-Italian war with the Saxons.¹¹ Also at the start of the *HLCG* the list of kings who ruled the Lombards before they reached Italy differs from that in other versions of the tradition.¹² This material is not recorded in a historical text which certainly was to be found in Eberhard's law-book, the *Origo Gentis*

⁵Azzara cit.

⁶See e.g. D. A. Bullough, 'Ethnic History and the Carolingians: an Alternative Reading of Paul the Deacon's *Historia Langobardorum*', *The Inheritance of Historiography* eds. C. Holdsworth & T. P. Wiseman, pp. 85-101 [repr. *Carolingian Renewal*], esp. pp. 100f.

⁷See below n. 12.

⁸Gotha, Forschungsbibliothek I. 84; the manuscript has been described many times, first by J. Merkel, 'Das Bairische Volksrecht', *Archiv* XI (1858) pp. 604-12 (the *HLCG* is the 'historisches Fragment' mentioned near the bottom of p. 609); most recently H. Hoffmann *Buchkunst und Königtum in Ottonischen und frühsalischen Reich* (MGH Schriften XXX, 1.) pp. 238-9; H. Mordek, *Bibliotheca Capitularium regum Francorum*, (MGH Hilfsmittel 15; Munich, 1995), pp. 131-49.

⁹P. E. Schramm & F. Mütterich, *Denkmale der Deutschen Könige*, (Munich, 1962), pp. 93-4; R. McKitterick, *The Carolingians and the Use of the Written Word*, (Cambridge, 1987) table A, p. 55, and pp. 246, 260-1; the most concise recent summary is P. E. Lockwood, *Lupus of Ferrières* (unpublished PhD thesis, Univ. of London 1993) pp. 337-8.

¹⁰Azzara *Leggi*, p. xxxv.

¹¹*HLCG* c.2; J. Jarnut, 'I Longobardi nell' Epoca Precedente all' Occupazione dell' Italia', eds. Cammorasano & Gasparri, *Langobardia* (Udine, 1990) pp. 3-35 at 16.

¹²Four other versions of the king-list, all the same and probably related, survive in the prologue to Rothari's Edict; Paul the Deacon *Historia Langobardorum* Bk I; *Origo Gentis Langobardorum* [see below]; Andreas of Bergamo (which is certainly based on Paul's version, itself probably based on Rothari). *HLCG* c. 3 omits Lamissio, Lethuc and Hildeoc and substitutes in their place a king called Pero. L. Capo, *Storia dei Longobardi*, (Fondazione Valla, 1993), p. 389, n. 18.

Langobardorum,¹³ thus the two texts would appear to be independent. The codicology of the Gotha manuscript reinforces this belief since it includes the entire text of Eberhard's book (as copied in the Modena O. I. 2 manuscript which was also derived from the Eberhard book)¹⁴ and then includes an extra set of capitularies not in the Modena manuscript and therefore from another source. The *HLCG* prefaces these capitularies which may have been copied from another archetype, although this cannot be proved.¹⁵ Moreover the *origo* appears to have had an independent life from the *HLCG*, since it appears in two other manuscripts¹⁶ where the *HLCG* is absent. This tends to reinforce the belief that the capitulary collection to which the *origo* was attached was not part of Eberhard's law-book. Hence the *HLCG*'s origin is unknown and it is therefore anonymous, although for reasons connected with its content it is presumed to have come from an Italian source.

Despite being one of the *origines gentium* texts which have recently received renewed scholarly attention¹⁷ the *HLCG* itself has barely ever been considered as a literary text on its own terms.¹⁸ The *HLCG* presents, in nine unequal chapters, a very distinctive view of Lombard history. Starting with a brief resumé of Lombard oral traditions it moves through the history of Lombard kingdom in Italy to culminate with the arrival of the Franks and a

¹³MGH SS RL pp.1-7 ed. G.Waitz; most recent edition ed. Azzara op. cit. pp. 2-7.

¹⁴McKitterick, Lockwood op.cit.; Merkel, *Archiv* XI pp. 596-604 describes the Modena manuscript.

¹⁵These capitularies are: MGH Cap. II, nos. 138-41 of Louis the Pious; of Lothar I nos.166, 175; of Louis II nos. 212, pp. 84-5; 213, pp. 86-8; 228, pp. 117-22.

¹⁶Cava 22, a legal collection, and Madrid, Biblioteca Nacional 413 (formerly Regius D.117); Waitz MGH SS RL p.1; Azzara intro. *Leggi* p. xxiv following other Italian historians, (G. Restelli, *Goti Tedeschi e Longobardi: Rapporti di Cultura e di Lingua* (Studi Grammaticali e Linguistici 16; Brescia, 1984), pp. 83-5) and presumably because the *Origo Gentis Langobardorum* ends with the reign of Perctarit, considers the *Origo* to be of Lombard date and origin, perhaps even seventh century.

¹⁷Neither S. Reynolds, 'Medieval *origines gentium* and the Community of the Realm', *History* 68 (1983), pp. 375-90 nor H. Wolfram, 'Le genre de l'*origo gentis*', *Rev Belge* LXVIII. 4 (1990), pp. 789-801 discuss it, although they do consider the *origo gentis langobardorum*.

¹⁸Although it has been used to try and recover the pre-Italian history of the Lombards, where its reports have generally been disparaged in comparison to more 'reliable' texts such as the *origo gentis langobardorum*: for full refs. and discussion Capo, *Storia dei Longobardi*, pp. 371, 372, 384, 385, 388, 389, 391, 394, 396, 398, 400-2, 420, 429, 430, 449, 452, 453, 455, 471, 484, 485, 490, 516, 520-2, 526, 528, 530, 538, 553, 556, 573, 575, 583, 610.

very positive assessment of their impact.¹⁹ It almost certainly reflects the type of propaganda the Carolingians would have circulated, although no aspect of the text identifies its place of composition or other useful details. Even a cursory reading of the text reveals a number of aspects, especially its emphasis on law, Christianity and the benefits the Carolingians have brought. Evidently a three way tie-up was intended since law was a key element of Christianity and the Carolingians saw the maintenance of justice as one of their prime functions. It is not accidental that the distinct Lombard legal tradition was maintained in Italy by the Carolingians after 774.

In c.1 the forefathers of the Lombards have no law and live an almost Hobbesian existence: *...deinter serpentibus parentes eorum breviati exissent, sanguinea et aspera progenes, sine lege*. Their wanderings come to an end when they enter Italy, for them a promised land 'flowing with milk and honey'²⁰ and are baptized. This key event incorporated the Lombards under the law and the author cites Scripture to justify their previous actions: *non imputatur peccatum, cum lex non esset*.²¹ The effect of this change is startling for they turn from 'ferocious wolves' to 'lambs in the pasture of the Lord'²². This change of nature is followed by the Lombards generating (in the author's view beginning) their own law under Rothari. The *HLCG* places the emphasis on the law rather than on the king in this passage.²³ It is law not royalty which is to be the great Lombard inheritance and this is made clear later when the only aspect of Lombard culture whose preservation after the Frankish conquest the writer considered worth recording was Charlemagne's concession of Lombard law. This also has the effect of making

¹⁹Ed. H. Löwe, W. Wattenbach & W. Levison, *Deutschlands Geschichtsquellen im Mittelalter: Vorzeit und Karolinger* vol. IV, [henceforward Löwe, *DG*] p. 207 regards it as indicative of a reconciliation with Carolingian lordship.

²⁰*HLCG* c.1 *Fluentem lac et mel*.

²¹*HLCG* c. 1; Rom.5, 13.

²²*HLCG* c.1: *Primis lupi rapaces, postea agni inter dominicum gregem pascendes*.

²³*HLCG* c.7: *Per quem [i.e. Rothari] leges et iusticiam langobardis est inchoata...istius Rothari regis temporibus ortum est lumen in tenebris*.

Charlemagne's legislation look like the only law-giving since Rothari's time. After Rothari only the regnal lengths of Lombard kings are recorded.

A strong Biblical element is obvious throughout; understanding the Lombards as a chosen people would be an easy step. The *HLCG* refrains from making this explicit, perhaps, as has been suggested for Paul the Deacon, because of an unwillingness to confirm such an idea based on pagan beliefs.²⁴ Certainly this idea has been taken seriously and it has been suggested that the wanderings at the start of the text are a necessary prelude to their conversion and arrival in the promised land.²⁵ But the text takes a sharp deviation from this line towards one concerning the incorporation of the Lombards in the Carolingian empire.

This incorporation is based not on an ethnic reading of the past, like Paul the Deacon's,²⁶ but on a religious one. It therefore continues the theme of the earlier part of the text. The key distinction between peoples in the *HLCG* is between those within the Carolingian empire and those outside it. Thus Avars, Moors, *Boemi*-Slavs are all referred to only by their ethnic names but within the Carolingian empire all ethnic labels are dissolved. It is not peoples who are oppressed but places, like Corsica, Sardinia and Thrace.²⁷ Even those territories not originally part of the Roman empire are given 'provincial' names based on a Romanized version of their ethnic names i.e. Saxonia. This may be why the *HLCG* claims that 'the kingdom of the Lombards was ended and the kingdom of Italy began'²⁸ when Charlemagne conquered it. Its ethnic appellation had been subsumed within a wider Christian polity. The continuation of Lombard law and even the Lombard royal title for many years thereafter was not significant to the author in this

²⁴W. Goffart, *Narrators of Barbarian History*, (Princeton, 1988), p. 382.

²⁵Löwe, *DG IV* p. 207.

²⁶Bullough, 'Ethnic History', *passim*.

²⁷Also it is places which are conquered by Charlemagne and not peoples: *HLCG* c.9 *Postquam italiam coepit, Spaniam suos terminos posuit; deinde Saxoniam perdomuit; post Bavariam dominator existet but super innumerabiles gentes eius timor irruit.*

²⁸*HLCG* c.9: After listing Desiderius's and Adelchis's regnal lengths: *Hic finitum est regnum langobardorum et incoavit regnum italiae...*

context. Of course the *HLCG* does not refer to the continued use of the Lombard title so strictly it lies outside the limits of the text. On the other hand Charlemagne's continuation of Lombard law can thus be seen more as a gracious concession rather than any reflection of Lombard continuity. The text points out that Charlemagne *poterat omnia demollire, factus est clemens indultor*. The point is repeated in the next line since he also *innumerabilibus viris, qui eidem culparunt incessanter, culpas dimisit*. But the changed circumstances after 774 are also clear: Charlemagne granted the Lombards the laws of their forefathers but also retained the right to add to them his own laws *ut voluit*.²⁹ Given the author's emphasis on law as an aspect of Christianity (indeed the most important aspect) Charlemagne's decision to continue to use law would seem appropriate.

As the Lombards lost their ethnic label within a larger polity and their laws were progressively diluted there was no doubt the Franks ran the empire. They are the only exception to the rule that in the *HLCG* peoples within the Carolingian empire are subsumed within a territorial unit for, after Pippin had been granted Italy, the *Tratia provincia una cum abaris ad francorum servitutem est redacta*. The Avars are condemned: *ab inicio malorum stirpe inimici aecclesiarum, persecutores christianorum semper fuerunt*. Thus the campaign against the Avars is cast in particularly strong Christian light. Their defeat, and Pippin and his father's care, mean that the *sanctae ecclesiae defensatae* and many of the spoils taken by the Avars (the *vasa sanctorum, quae illi crudeles et impiis rapuerunt*) were returned. This view of the 796 campaign reproduces the opinion of the Pippin *rythmus* written to celebrate that victory and possibly does support an attribution to Verona for the *HLCG*, although it is slender evidence.³⁰ Certainly Pippin's prominent role in the *HLCG* strongly supports an Italian origin for the text.

²⁹*HLCG* c.9: *Et paternae patriae leges langobardis misertus concessit, et suas, ut voluit, quae necessaria erant langobardis, adiunxit.*

³⁰*MGH Poetae Latini Aevi Carolini*, ed. E. Dümmler, (Berlin, 1881), I pp.120-2; P. Godman, *Poetry of the Carolingian Renaissance*, (London, 1987) pp. 29-30.

Unlike the earlier poem, however, in the *HLCG* Pippin's campaigns are detailed, against Benevento (significantly described as a province, in accord with its Roman nomenclature but distinguished from its oath-breaking *populus*), against the *Beowindi* and against the Moors in Corsica (it is the island which is described as oppressed, not its people). Pippin's campaigns therefore all have in common a religious element since they are aimed at infidels. (The Beneventans are perjurers and so outside the bounds of acceptable Christian society³¹). In this Pippin's campaigns differ from Charlemagne's listed in the *HLCG* in Spain, Bavaria and 'Saxonia'.

Charlemagne is described as *gloriosissimum Carolum regem Francorum; qui adiuvator et defensor domni Petri principis apostolorum ab italia perrexerat eius iusticiam requirendum*. The Frankish conqueror was therefore driven not by any *lucri cupiditas... sed bono, pius et misericors factus est adiuvator*. That the conquest of the Lombards had been carried out to protect the Papacy was of course the standard Carolingian explanation for 773-4.

In all these examples the centrality of law in the *HLCG* is clear. The Lombards were brought into Christianity by their acceptance of law. It was this which marked out their entry into the civilized world. Lombard kings were legislators; law was their greatest achievement and the only one to survive the Frankish conquest. This conquest was undertaken to ensure justice for the Papacy and not for temporal gain. The Carolingians then continued and extended the law. The result was peace and prosperity 'as in ancient times'. In the *HLCG* the Carolingians were thus presented as great legislators and great soldiers. The vision of their government offered in this text emphasizes their distinctness

³¹*HLCG* c. 9 *Digni fuerunt suae prevaricationis sacramenti, cives eorum igne sunt exanimati et consumpti, et populus eorum capitalem subierunt sententiam*. Note too that the Avars are supposedly driven out of 'Thrace', as are the Moors from Corsica, other examples of a 'province' and its people being mismatched. In Benevento however there was no convenient term to distinguish its current (illegitimate?) inhabitants from the territory itself so the author had to make do with *populus* in contradistinction to *provincia*.

from their Lombard predecessors but also their success and the fundamental continuity (and improvement) of law which they had provided.

The *HLCG*, as its codicological context along with the *origo gentis langobardorum* in Gotha I. 84 suggests, is more a historical introduction to a legal collection than a piece of historical writing in its own right. It is not an interpretative narrative like the works of Paul the Deacon or Erchempert or even Andreas of Bergamo. It represents the Carolingians only as law-givers and maintainers. The whole account is based around the way law and Christianity interacted to tame the ferocity of the Lombards. Charlemagne and Pippin appear only as the last, albeit perhaps greatest, of the law-makers. The current ideal conditions are the result of these activities.

Agnellus of Ravenna: Agnellus of Ravenna's serial biography of the archbishops of his see from its founder, St. Apollinaris (supposedly a disciple of Peter) to the mid-ninth century³² (with precious information for the years after the fifth century) is the longest historical work from ninth century Italy. The earliest manuscript survives from the early fifteenth century³³ however the text itself was written between 830 and some date shortly after 846. Regrettably the account is not quite complete: it breaks off during a description of archbishop George's funeral (846). In addition several archbishops' lives are missing (Valerius (788/9-802) and Petronax (c.817-34×9) entirely - Sergius (750-c.770), Leo (770/1-78), John VII (778-c.785), Martin (c.810-17) are incomplete).³⁴ Otherwise

³²Agnellus, *Liber Pontificalis Ecclesiae Ravennatis* ed. Holder-Egger, *MGH SS RL* pp. 278-391. All references are to this edition. A. Testi-Rasponi, *Muratori RSI* (1905) produced a superior but incomplete edition. A new edition is now in preparation by Deborah Mauskopf Deliyani (Pennsylvania) for OUP. The most recent synthesis is P. Benericetti, *Il Pontificale di Ravenna: Studio Critico*, (Faenza, 1994) which although very thorough adds little new.

³³Detailed descriptions of the manuscript in the edition of A. Testi-Rasponi *Rerum Italicarum Scriptores* vol. II pt. II, fasc. I, pp. VI-VIII (*Raccolta degli Storici Italiani...*) publ. by Istituto Storico Italiano 1924; more recently J. O. Tjäder, 'Die Bestrafung des Notars Johannicus im «Liber Pontificalis» des Agnellus', *Italia Medioevale e Umanistica* II (1959) pp. 431-39 at 432-33 in notes. Later editions considered in A. Vasina, 'La Tradizione del «Liber Pontificalis» di Agnello Ravennate Fino al XVI Secolo', *Storiografia e Storia. Studi in Onore di Eugenio Duprè Theseider* (Rome, 1974) vol. I pp. 217-67.

³⁴G. Lanzoni, 'Il Liber Pontificalis Ravennate', *Rivista di Scienze Storiche* 1909 fasc. IV pp. 345-70; V 425-64; VI 571-92, at IV 347; G. Fasoli, 'Rileggendo il «Liber Pontificalis» di Agnello Ravennate', *La Storiografia Altomedioevale*, (*SS Spol* XVII 1969 - publ. 1970) pp. 457-95, at 458 n.5 [reprinted in id. *Scritti di Storia Medioevale* (Bologna, 1974) pp. 105-36].

Agnellus wrote a complete history running from the foundation of the see to his own time. Agnellus has been the subject of very many studies by art historians keen to use his lengthy descriptions of buildings and mosaics. These works have not analyzed Agnellus as a writer or considered the structure of his text but have rather used the history as a mine of information without discussing its wider nature. None of these art-historical studies are strictly relevant to the subject here.³⁵

There are a number of textual studies on Agnellus, however. A rare scholarly accord exists and has been repeated frequently: Agnellus's account has an extremely narrow outlook. He is only interested in Ravenna and its archbishops. Everything else is contingent on that core topic.³⁶ More precisely it has been argued that Agnellus was writing for the Ravennate clergy rather than the archbishop and many of his criticisms of the city's episcopate can be understood in the light of a belief that the incumbent had to behave correctly towards both them and the traditions of the diocese.³⁷ My aim here is to examine all Agnellus's references to the Carolingians in Agnellus's account and consider their significance in the context of the rest of the work.

³⁵Such works are too numerous to list since they include virtually everything concerning the period c.450-c.850. Special mention must be given to H. L. Gonin, *Excerpta Agnelliana: The Ravennate Liber Pontificalis as a Source for the History of Art* (Utrecht, 1933) and to C. Nauwerth, *Agnellus von Ravenna. Untersuchungen zur archäologischen Methode des ravennatischen Chronisten* (Münchener Beiträge zur Mediävistik und Renaissance Forschung. 15 - 1974), which both analyze those sections of the text concerned with descriptions of art objects or buildings. Cf. *Storia di Ravenna* vol. II. 1 ed. A. Carile (Venice, 1992).

³⁶T. S. Brown, 'Romanitas and Campanilismo: Agnellus of Ravenna's View of the Past', *The Inheritance of Historiography 350-900* ed. C. J. Holdsworth & T. P. Wiseman (Exeter, 1981) pp. 107-14, esp. 107-8, 110-11.

³⁷P. Lamma, 'Agnello di Ravenna', *Dizionario Biografico degli Italiani* (Rome, 1961) vol I pp. 429-30; O. Capitani, 'Agnello Ravennate nella recente Storia della Storiografia Medievale', *Felix Ravenna* 105 (1973), pp. 183-98 at 185, 190-2; most thoroughly by A. M. Orselli, 'Vita Religiosa nella Città Medievale Italiana tra Dimensione Ecclesiastica e 'Cristianesimo Civico'. Una Esempificazione', *Annali dell'Istituto Storico Italo-Germanico in Trento* VII (1981), pp. 361- 98 at 372-6; J. C. Picard, *Les Souvenirs des Évêques. Listes Épiscopales et Culte des Évêques en Italie du Nord des Origines au Xe Siècle* (École Française de Rome, 1988) p. 548; A. Carile, 'Agnello Storico', *SRavenna* II, 2 pp. 375-6; this (and much else) was intuited but not demonstrated by E. Bishop, 'An Antiquary of the Ninth Century (Agnellus of Ravenna)', *Liturgica Historica* (London, 1905) pp. 378-9: 'Agnellus's padding [sic]...is well worth reading as a genuine rendering of the thoughts and ideas of the Ravennese higher clerical society of the day.'

Pippin the Short is the first Carolingian to make an appearance in Agnellus's text but since he never visited the city his role is necessarily limited. Agnellus was aware that Pippin had been made king and anointed by the pope but not that he had led the Franks into Italy (although since Sergius's life is damaged perhaps the account of this has been lost).³⁸ Agnellus divided his account of events concerning Pippin with a chapter concerning Aistulf's activities in Ravenna.³⁹ Unfortunately Agnellus muddled the personnel involved. He claims Zacharias travelled across the Alps; in fact it was Stephen II.⁴⁰ He has a better grasp, however, of the ceremony performed in 754. 'But once the other king had been ejected from the throne of the Franks, Pippin accepted the sceptre of the kingdom and was blessed by the hands of the pope and anointed by him with holy oil'.⁴¹ This account, though similar to the *LP*'s,⁴² omits to mention the anointing of Pippin's sons and also that of his wife recorded in Frankish sources.

The other brief reference in Agnellus to Pippin records the supposed journey of archbishop Sergius with pope Paul I to Francia where 'whatever he asked for from king Pippin he obtained'. This is not recorded anywhere else. It is included as the background to an attempt by the pope to deprive Sergius of his see. Sergius became 'vexed' because he had been a support to Pippin but was still under papal control (perhaps implying that it was 'Paul' above who obtained all he requested). The purpose of the notice is to explain motivation and suggests little interest in Pippin himself. Both these reports, like the later account of Louis the Pious's meeting with Stephen IV [see below] appear to suggest

³⁸ Agnellus's knowledge of the mid-eighth century in general seems to have been poor: he does not record Aistulf's conquest of the city in the early 750s! See next note.

³⁹ Agnellus, p. 378 c. 156 describes Aistulf laying his arms on the altar of the cathedral perhaps as a symbolic demonstration of respect; R. Savigni, 'I Papi e Ravenna', *SRavenna* II, 2, p. 332 claims shows Aistulf wanted to 'ingraziarsi'.

⁴⁰ P. Jaffé, *Regesta Pontificum Romanorum* vol. I (1885) pp. 274, 271.

⁴¹ Agnellus, p. 378 c. 155, ll. 16-18: *Sed eiecto a solium Francorum altero rege, Pipinus sceptro regni accepit et papae manibus benedictus est atque crismate sacro ab eo perunctus est.*

⁴² *Liber Pontificalis* ed. L. Duchesne (Paris, 1886), vol. I, *Vita Stephani* c. XXVII, p. 448: *..et eo in eodem...monasterio [St. Denis] iamfatto christianissimo Pipino coniungente...post aliquantos dies hisdem christianissimus Pipinus rex ab eodem sanctissimo papa...cum duobus filiis suis reges uncti sunt.*

Agnellus was within the same tradition but not directly using the text and often confused.⁴³

The episodes directly concerning Charlemagne have been considered before by Fasoli whose dry account did little more than list the events in question and lament lost chapters of Agnellus concerning Valerius, which might have provided more information.⁴⁴ Agnellus describes Charlemagne's entry into Italy in 773 to conquer the Lombard kingdom,⁴⁵ his visit to Ravenna and meal with archbishop Gratosus,⁴⁶ the transport to Aachen of the statue of Theoderic⁴⁷, the silver table left in Charlemagne's will,⁴⁸ and the valuation of a lost crown.⁴⁹

Charlemagne's arrival in Italy in 773, recorded in the mutilated life of archbishop Leo,⁵⁰ was facilitated by a Ravennate deacon, Martin, who was probably despatched by the archbishop as a guide and as a way of establishing a relationship between Charlemagne and the archbishop.⁵¹ This would accord with later efforts by Ravenna's metropolitans to curry favour with the Carolingian rulers.⁵² Charlemagne's link to Martin may have improved Agnellus's opinion of the king because, later, as archbishop, Martin bestowed the *monasterium*⁵³ of S. Maria *ad Blachernae* on the author.⁵⁴ Agnellus is therefore partisan. The fact of the inclusion of the episode in Leo's vita unfortunately provides no context because the account is short and probably incomplete. The historical truth of

⁴³Agnellus, c. 157, p. 379, ll.2-3 ...*deinde Franciae arripuit iter, et quicquid ad Pipinum postulavit regem [sic], optinuit.* and p. 379 ll 3f. for the pope's effort to depose Sergius.

⁴⁴G. Fasoli, 'Carlo Magno nelle Tradizioni Storico-Leggendarie Italiane', *Karl der Grosse* IV ed. W. Braunfels et al (Dusseldorf, 1966), pp. at 357, 381, 383.

⁴⁵Agnellus, p. 381 c. 160.

⁴⁶Agnellus, p. 383-4, c. 165.

⁴⁷Agnellus, p. 338, c. 94.

⁴⁸Agnellus, p. 388 c. 170.

⁴⁹Agnellus, c.143 p. 372.

⁵⁰Lanzoni, 'Liber', p. 347; Fasoli, 'Rileggendo', p. 458 n. 5.

⁵¹Ed. Löwe, *DG* IV p. 431; M. Pierpaolo, *Storia di Ravenna. Dalle Origini al Mille*, (Ravenna, 1990), p. 212 & n. 18.

⁵²Brown, 'Louis' *passim*, esp. 300-1, 303, 305-6. Cf. below on Gratosus and George.

⁵³I retain the Latin term because doubts have been expressed about the exact meaning of the word. It has been suggested that Agnellus sometimes meant a burial chapel or suburban church: F. Wickhoff, 'Die "monasteria" bei Agnellus', *MIÖG* 9 (1888) pp. 34-45 esp. 45; Orselli, 'Vita', pp. 377-81, esp. 378-9.

⁵⁴Agnellus, p. 387, c. 167.

Martin's being a guide for Charlemagne's army has been doubted by Fasoli who records also the Novalese tradition that it was a Lombard traitor who acted as Charlemagne's guide.⁵⁵ Certainly Agnellus is the only source to record the invitation from Ravenna to Charlemagne to invade Italy⁵⁶ but he is more nearly contemporary than the Novalese source⁵⁷ and perhaps somewhat more to be relied upon.⁵⁸ The passage is so short that it is difficult to extract much from it. However Fasoli also noted that Agnellus recorded Charlemagne's relationship to Desiderius as son-in-law, perhaps implying an anti-Frankish bias. (Technically this is inaccurate since by the time he invaded north Italy Charlemagne had repudiated Desiderius's daughter.) Agnellus however probably got this information from the Roman *Liber Pontificalis* a source which I believe to have been more directly important for Agnellus than has sometimes been thought (see below). I am unconvinced that Agnellus meant to particularly emphasize this issue. He may be merely repeating information from the *LP*. The only other point of note in this passage is Agnellus's comment that Adelchis, Desiderius's son, fled to Salerno and thence to Constantinople when Charlemagne approached Rome.

Charlemagne's relations with Gratosus have been well-studied by Brown who concluded that the archbishop probably got what he wanted, although it's not certain quite what that was. Certainly Brown is right to note the strong influence Ravenna exercised over Charlemagne's concept of rulership, for example the Theoderic statue (below), and especially the title which he adopted (reflecting earlier Ravennese practices) to express his new imperial status and also the silver table he left to the see in his will.⁵⁹ Gratosus is another of Agnellus's favourites, however. *Vere Gratosus, quia gratia Dei perfusus*

⁵⁵Fasoli, 'Carlo Magno', p. 352; cf. *Chronicon Novaliciense* III, 10, *MGH SS VII* pp. 73f.

⁵⁶H. Taviani-Carozzi, *La Principauté Lombarde de Salerne (IX-XI siècles)*, (Collection de l'École Française de Rome 152; 1993) vol. I, p. 67.

⁵⁷H. Löwe ed. *Deutschlands Gechichtsquellen: Die Zeit der Sachsen und der Salier*, (1967) pp. 327-8 places the chronicle between 1027-50.

⁵⁸G. Penco, 'Tradizione Mediolatina e Fonti delle Romanze nel «Chronicon Novaliciense»', *Benedictina* 12 (1958), pp. 1-14 emphasizes the unreliability of much of the material concerning Charlemagne in the work, esp. pp. 6-8.

⁵⁹Brown, 'Louis', pp.301-2.

[fuit].⁶⁰ Charlemagne was suitably impressed during his visit in 787. After misunderstanding the archbishop's invitation to 'pappa', food,⁶¹ Agnellus has the king quote John I v. 47: Here indeed is a true Israelite, in whom there is no trickery. The point of the quotation seems to be to establish Gratosus's simplicity,⁶² (or perhaps better *simplicitas* in the sense of 'straightforwardness' or 'honesty') and equally importantly Charlemagne's recognition of it. After the confusion over dinner had been explained to the royal visitor, Agnellus says that Gratosus obtained all he asked for.

The statue of Theoderic taken from Ravenna in 801 to Aachen⁶³ has attracted much attention as an indication of Charlemagne's attachment to the image of Theoderic.⁶⁴ Agnellus mentions its removal not in the section of his work that deals with the late eighth century but much earlier in the text, as part of his description of the statue itself in the life of Peter IV (c.570-78). But the rather rambling chapter in question concerns Theoderic's building of a palace in Pavia, the adornment of the palace in Ravenna with a statue of him on the roof, and a consideration of the rival tradition that the statue was actually of the emperor Zeno and the reasons for the latter's rise to power (the absence of kneecaps, apparently⁶⁵). Thus Agnellus's description of the statue's final resting place is the termination of a discussion of the statue's history rather than any reflection on its

⁶⁰Agnellus, p. 383 c. 164; Berschin, *Biographie*, II p.157, notes Agnellus's fondness for deriving character from etymologies of the person's name although he cites no examples.

⁶¹Agnellus, p. 384 c.165. Some debate has gone on around the exact meaning of this part of the text. W. Ohnsorge, 'L'Idea d'Imperio nel secolo nono e l'Italia Meridionale', *Atti del 3 Congresso di Studi sull'Alto-Medioevo* (Spoleto, 1959) pp. 255-72 at 261-2 suggested that 'pappa' had been misinterpreted to mean pope and was a criticism of Charlemagne's 'caesaro-papism'. Cf. Brown, 'Campanilismo', pp. 109 & 113, n. 15. This suggestion has been decisively rejected by Carile, 'Agnello Storico', *SRavenna* II, 2, p. 378, n.16 in favour of the culinary interpretation.

⁶²Savigni, 'Papi', *SRavenna* II, 2, p. 338.

⁶³Agnellus, c. 94 p. 338, ll.17-21: *Nunc pene annis 38, cum Karolus rex Francorum omnia subiugasset regna et Romanorum percepisset a Leone III papa imperium, postquam ad corpus beati Petri sacramentum praebuit, revertens Franciam, Ravennam ingressus, videns pulcerrimam [sic] imaginem, quam nunquam similem, ut ipse testatus est, vidit, Franciam deportare fecit atque in suo eam firmare palatio qui Aquisgranis vocatur.*

⁶⁴H. Löwe, 'Von Theoderich dem Großen zu Karl der Großen. Das Werden des Abendlandes im Geschichtsbild des frühen Mittelalters', *DA* 9 (1952), pp. 353-401, esp. 389, 392-3; J. Moorhead, 'The West and the Roman Past: from Theoderic to Charlemagne', *History and Historians in Late Antiquity* eds. B. Croke & A. M. Emmett (1983) pp. 155-68 at 162.

⁶⁵Brown, 'Campanilismo', pp. 109, & 113 n. 14.

significance to Charlemagne. Analyses of great subtlety have been built around Charlemagne's desire to possess the statue but none of this is to be found in Agnellus's account. He simply says that almost 38 years ago on his return from visiting pope Leo III in Rome after the imperial coronation (strikingly, Agnellus's only reference to this⁶⁶ - and even here he refers to *Karolus rex Francorum*) Charlemagne stopped in Ravenna and saw the 'most beautiful statue' which he then took away to set up 'in the palace called Aachen'. The reference to the imperial coronation is only designed as context to help place the reader chronologically, since Agnellus is taking the event out of sequence in his work. He does not invest the statue with any ideological significance. Clearly if the Franks attached special importance to Theoderic or his statue this was either not known or not thought important in Ravenna. For Agnellus the key point is that the statue was very beautiful and Charlemagne's interest is explained thus. Bullough has tacitly accepted this view of the statue (although in connection with Charlemagne's use of it) when he described it as 'possessing the symbolism of the Rolls Royce'.⁶⁷ Note Agnellus does not criticize Charlemagne in any way for taking the statue.

Agnellus also mentions the donation in Charlemagne's will of a silver table inscribed with a map on it as described by Einhard.⁶⁸ Brown has interpreted this gift as a wry joke at the expense of the squabbles, which Charlemagne was asked to resolve, between the sees of Rome and Ravenna.⁶⁹ Agnellus did not appear to see the table in this light. He describes its appearance and emphasizes its beauty and value.⁷⁰ Lastly there is the slender reference to Charlemagne concerning a crown given by Justinian II's successor as emperor (Pelagius

⁶⁶T. S. Brown, 'The Interplay Between Roman and Byzantine Traditions and Local Sentiment in the Exarchate of Ravenna', *Bisanzio, Roma e l'Italia nell' Alto Medioevo* (SS Spol 1986; publ. 1988), pp. 127-60 at 157 notes Agnellus's essential neutrality towards both empires.

⁶⁷D. A. Bullough, 'Imagines Regnum and their Significance in the Early Medieval West', *Carolingian Renewal*, pp. 39-70 at 61-2 [orig. publ. in *Studies in Memory of David Talbot Rice* ed. G. Robertson & G. Henderson (Edinburgh, 1975)]. The most recent account of the statue is P. Puccinini, 'Immagini d'Autorità a Ravenna', *SRavenna* II, 2, pp. 47-8 which astonishingly omits to mention Charlemagne at all.

⁶⁸Einhard, *Vita Karoli Magni* c. 33.

⁶⁹Brown, 'Louis' pp. 301-2.

⁷⁰Agnellus, c. 170, p. 388; Nauwerth, *Agnellus* pp. 79-80.

says Agnellus - actually ^{Philippicus}). To obtain a valuation of this crown Agnellus asked a *Iudeus negotians Karolo imperatori* how much it would be worth. The Jewish merchant replied that all the riches of the church (of Ravenna) would not be sufficient.⁷¹ Then, as Brown says, Agnellus 'ominously remarked' that it had disappeared in George's time.⁷² It is almost certainly intended as a pre-echo (perhaps even a prophecy⁷³) of George's mismanagement and the loss of his church's treasures.⁷⁴ The reference to Charlemagne is *en passant*. Probably the role of the Jew is more significant,⁷⁵ as a financially astute figure able to give an independent confirmation of the exceptional value of the lost crown.

Agnellus's surviving account of Charlemagne therefore boils down to one state visit, the influence of a Ravennese guide on the Frankish conquest of the Lombards and Charlemagne's association with three objects.⁷⁶ This seems to reflect Agnellus's working method rather than any particular approach to Charlemagne. Evidently he had good sources for Martin's activity in 773 and Charlemagne's visit in 787. His approach to the objects is of a piece with his general description of works of art in Ravenna. He is interested in their history and appearance rather than seeing them imbued with any special significance by association with the Carolingians. Given Agnellus's Ravennese chauvinism this is hardly surprising.

⁷¹Agnellus, c.143, p.372, l.9-12: *...temporibus nostris interrogatus Iudeus negotians Karolo imperatori, quo precio venundari possit, adiecit, quod omnes opes istius ecclesiae et omnia ornamenta etiam et tuguria venundentur, non potest eam explere. A tempore Georgii non cumparuit.*

⁷²Brown, 'Louis', p. 306 but the object in question is not a jewelled cross as Brown claims but a *corona*.

⁷³Fasoli, 'Rileggendo', p. 469.

⁷⁴Cf. on George: Agnellus, c.166, p. 385, ll. 20-22, Gratosus' prophecy that wooden liturgical vessels would have to be used on the altar; other criticisms of George c. 136, p. 366; cf. the words of Charles the Bald after Fontenoy concerning the loss of church treasures c. 174, pp. 390-91 and below pp. 50-2.

⁷⁵B. Blumenkranz, *Les Auteurs Chrétiens Latins du Moyen Age sur les Juifs et le Judaïsme* (Paris, 1963) pp. 181-2, no. 155 notes the report but does not appear to be aware of its symbolic significance in the text; cf. Blumenkranz, *Juifs et Chrétiens dans le Monde Occidental 430-1096* (Paris, 1960), pp. 44-5. Agnellus refers to only one other Jew, who converts following a vision of the Lamb on the altar: Agnellus c. 133, p. 365; Blumenkranz, *Auteurs* no.154, p. 181; *ibid. Juifs* pp. 86-7.

⁷⁶The objects are the statue of Theoderic, the silver table and the crown. The crown has almost nothing to do with Charlemagne outside this context.

Both Fasoli and Brown have understood Agnellus to be hostile to Charlemagne.⁷⁷ I confess I cannot see the evidence for this view. In all of the episodes above Agnellus never once offers a qualitative opinion concerning Charlemagne, not even an adjective (except *Francus*). In this we may, as Fasoli suggested, be hampered by the loss of the crucial life of Valerius. However one cannot base analysis on what might have existed. Agnellus's account as it stands is virtually judgement-free when it comes to Charlemagne. Even his removal of Theoderic's statue is recorded without critical comment. I would conclude from this that Charlemagne was simply not of much interest given the Ravennocentric attitude dominant in Agnellus.

Pippin of Italy is mentioned only once, to record his death⁷⁸ and Bernard never. Brown has tentatively suggested that a better tradition may have been associated with Pippin in Ravenna than survives because a sixteenth century source refers to him as *christianissimus* but Brown acknowledges the problems raised by the lateness of this source.⁷⁹ The term *christianissimus* has echoes of the *excellentissimus* used in Lombard charters and may refer to a lost grant. It is possible that more information was contained in the lost life of Valerius (788-802) and the mutilated *vitae* of Leo (770-78), John VII (778-85) and Martin (802-18).⁸⁰

Louis the Pious's accession is recorded by Agnellus immediately after his report of Pippin's and Charlemagne's deaths. The only other account concerning Louis relates to 816. (No report survives in Agnellus concerning Louis's visit to Ravenna in 793 returning from campaign against Benevento since the life of Valerius, in which it would have fallen, is lost (see above)⁸¹.) The details described in Frankish sources⁸² concerning the anointing

⁷⁷Fasoli, 'Carlo Magno', p. 381; Brown, 'Louis', p. 303 '...Agnellus does not display the hostility to Louis which he showed to Charles...'

⁷⁸Agnellus, p. 387 c.168.

⁷⁹Brown, 'Louis', pp. 302, 301; from Rossi, *Historiarum Ravennatum* v. 234-5 which was unavailable to me.

⁸⁰Lanzoni, 'Liber', p. 347; Fasoli, 'Rileggendo', p. 458 n. 5; see Agnellus, p. 381 for Leo, pp. 381-3, Martin pp. 386-8. In John's life the lacunae affect c.774-8; see Holder-Egger's comments p. 381 n. d; Fasoli 'Carlo Magno', p. 357.

⁸¹On 793 Astronomer, *Vita Hludovici Imperatoris*, MGH SS II p. 210 c.6; Brown, 'Louis', p. 301.

of Louis the Pious's wife and sons during the visit of pope Stephen IV to Frankia in October 816 are wholly missing. This seems again to suggest that Agnellus's account was drawn from the *LP* since Agnellus's claim that the pope obtained everything he asked for from the emperor is very close to the *LP*'s similarly laconic description.⁸³ It is impossible to be certain however whether he was drawing on the text of the *LP* or was only influenced by the Papacy's presentation of events. The pope's presence in Ravenna in 816 obviously offered a way for the Papal account concerning the Frankish visit to be introduced into the city and to reach Agnellus later without coming via the *LP*. His version may therefore have only been influenced by the Roman tradition rather than directly drawing upon it. This is moreover one of only two points at which Agnellus refers to Louis. The purpose of the narrative here is to describe the reconciliation between the sees of Rome and Ravenna.⁸⁴ In this sense Agnellus's reference to Louis and the pope's Frankish trip are only included as context, in order to explain Stephen IV's presence in Ravenna. Similarly it is here that Charlemagne's bequest of a silver table is described (see above). Louis is merely mentioned as the transmitter of the object and then Agnellus moves on to a description of the table. It is evidently the table's value and beauty which most interests him, not Louis the Pious's role in its sending.⁸⁵

However Agnellus's view of the meeting between the pope and Louis the Pious is reminiscent of his version of events surrounding Charlemagne's meeting with Gratosus and an earlier pope's visit to Frankia, considered earlier. The key element of these descriptions was their outcome: the prelate in each case obtained everything he asked for. This tends to suggest that Agnellus's understanding of these encounters was dominated by his local-ecclesiastical outlook. Rulers, especially Carolingian ones, were expected to acquiesce gracefully in ecclesiastical demands, and by precedent always had. It is their

⁸²*Annales Regni Francorum* a. 816, p. 144.

⁸³*LP* II ed. Duchesne *Vita Stephani* c. 2, p. 49.

⁸⁴Agnellus, c.170, p. 388; cf. Pierpaolo, *Ravenna*, pp. 216-17; Savigni, 'Papi', *SRavenna* II, 2, p. 342.

⁸⁵Nauerth, *Agnellus*, pp. 79-80.

confirmatory role Agnellus recalls, not their obstreporousness or objections.⁸⁶ From this particular perspective his view of the Carolingians is distant but approving.

Agnellus provides some information about Lothar, largely because of his association with archbishop George who is of keen interest to the author. There is only one reference to Lothar outside George's *vita*. At the end of the *vita* of archbishop Maurus (642-71) Agnellus recounts that Lothar was permitted to take away Maurus's tombstone to be used as an altar at an unspecified church in Frankia dedicated to St. Sebastian (often thought to be at Soissons⁸⁷). Agnellus himself was commissioned by archbishop Petronax to supervise the work but found it too painful to watch.⁸⁸ This powerful emotional reaction⁸⁹ on Agnellus's part might lead us to think that Lothar would get a bad press from Agnellus yet this does not seem to be so. Brown says that because of antipathy to Petronax Agnellus recorded the event with 'implicit disapproval' and his 'outrage was compounded when the slab was broken while being moved'.⁹⁰ It is open to question whether Agnellus's disapproval was aimed at the emperor. Fasoli's comment that Agnellus was against the removal of the tombstone⁹¹ is clearly correct, but this is not the same thing as criticizing Lothar. In the passage itself Agnellus does not level any criticism at Lothar or Petronax despite his evident distress at seeing one of Ravenna's monuments removed. Both Lothar and Petronax were alive when Agnellus was writing, but at least against Petronax Agnellus could have later inserted criticisms in the 'second edition'⁹² he produced following

⁸⁶Which Brown, 'Louis', pp. 301-2 is surely right to hypothesize, but let us note Agnellus does not recall this.

⁸⁷Bishop, 'Antiquary', p. 381.

⁸⁸Agnellus, c. 113, p. 352, ll. 26-30: *Sed pene annos 12, tempore Petronacis pontificis Lotharius augustus tollere [i.e. the tombstone] iussit,...et Franciam deportavit et super altarium sancti Sebastiani mensam ut esset, posuit. Praeceptum mihi a pontifice fuit, ut ego illuc issem, ne caementarii incaute agerent, frangeretur; sed corde dolore pleno in partem aliam secessi*. Regrettably, despite the editor's suggestion of 841/2 as the date of composition it is not clear exactly which year this should be attributed to and hence in which year Lothar removed the stone. Cf. a similar incident in Agnellus, c. 83, p. 333 referring to c. 832/3.

⁸⁹Bishop, 'Antiquary', p. 381; Fasoli, 'Rileggendo', p. 479.

⁹⁰Brown, 'Louis', p. 304.

⁹¹Fasoli, 'Rileggendo' p. 479.

⁹²Lanzoni, 'Liber', p. 369.

George's death in 846.⁹³ Lothar was still alive then of course and Agnellus might have thought it imprudent to express any negative sentiments concerning even such a minor imperial action but this must remain conjecture. Moreover Agnellus's neutral view of Charlemagne might suggest rather that, as ever, Carolingian activity interested him relatively little.

As for Lothar's own purpose in taking the tombstone we have no direct evidence. Agnellus goes out of his way to emphasize the exceptional beauty of the porphyry stone⁹⁴ so perhaps it was merely its quality which attracted the emperor's interest. Possibly Lothar also had in mind Charlemagne's removal of marbles and columns for Aachen. Lothar may have understood these as imperial actions. Certainly the transfer of an object of such value from a city of substantial importance to the concept of empire is striking and implies that the transfer had some ideological significance. Appropriate tombstones must have been available nearer the recipient site. One presumes therefore that the Ravenna origin of the piece was of special significance. What this was is unclear. Later traditions recorded Lothar *multa...Ravennae nova constituit, Ravennamque plurimum frequentavit*.⁹⁵ This suggests more of a background to this episode than we now know.

The *vita* of George contains more material about members of the Carolingian family than any other life. It is as close as Agnellus comes to a coherent image of the dynasty. It has to be borne in mind that Agnellus was writing this section of his text after George's disastrous venture into Frankish politics in the 840s, as the highly critical comments about the archbishop show and also that Agnellus had a personal axe to grind concerning the

⁹³Brown, 'Louis', p. 304 & nn. 48-49 does see some criticism of Petronax by Agnellus, but the generalized criticism of corrupt archbishops is hard to link specifically to Petronax alone. Moreover criticism of corruption sits uncomfortably with Brown's own view of Agnellus's acceptance of corruption in the form of the bribe paid to obtain the *monasterium* of S. Maria *ad Blachernas*: Agnellus c.167, p. 387; Brown, *Gentlemen*, pp. 189, 172. To be fair to Brown it would be typical of Agnellus to accept the propriety of his own bribes but not those paid by an archbishop to Rome. However this does not affect the fact that, even if Brown is right, Agnellus's (at best implicit) criticism is levelled at only Petronax, not Lothar. Moreover, cf. Agnellus's description of Lothar in c. 174: see below.

⁹⁴Agnellus, p. 352, c. 113, ll. 22-26.

⁹⁵Thus Rossi, *Historiarum Ravennatum libri xi* v. 238; Brown, 'Louis' p. 305.

loss of his benefice of S. Bartolomeo.⁹⁶ The first episode he recounts here concerns Agnellus's role in the baptism of Lothar's daughter Rotruda⁹⁷ at Pavia in the first year of George's reign (probably 838).⁹⁸ Evidently at this time George and Agnellus were still close because Agnellus not only received Rotruda from the font but was also entrusted with the purchase for her, from the palace workshop⁹⁹, of a magnificent (and extremely expensive) baptismal gown costing 500 solidi.¹⁰⁰ Agnellus's account of the baptism is clearly influenced by his editorial approach to George's reign in general. Agnellus prefaces his description of the ceremony with the comment that George stole all the riches of the church of Ravenna and forced open the crypts to steal the treasure of his predecessors. Clearly this is another pre-echo of the loss of Ravenna's treasure in 841. However although Agnellus thus displays some retrospective ambivalence about the cost of the ceremony, it is clear that he was greatly impressed by the richness of the gown Rotruda was given and describes it carefully. He was personally responsible for dressing the (presumably) infant Rotruda which would have given him every opportunity to notice what it looked like. Interestingly, considering the space devoted to Lothar later in the life, the emperor is barely mentioned by Agnellus, only to say that Rotruda was his child.

Agnellus devotes far more space to a description of Ermengard, Lothar's wife. There are similarities with the later passage concerning Charles the Bald where Agnellus is

⁹⁶Fasoli, 'Rileggendo', p. 471 n. 39. Agnellus, p. 366, c.136.

⁹⁷Pierpaolo, *Ravenna*, pp. 217-18, 220 persistently and wrongly refers to her as Louis the Pious's daughter.

⁹⁸The date of the event cannot be determined with absolute certainty. Clearly 834-39 is the range available. Various individual years have been proposed without support: thus Lamma, 'Agnello', p. 429 'perhaps 837-8'. However most convincing is A. Testi-Rasponi, 'Note Agnelliane. La Data dell' Elezione dell' Arcivescovo Giorgio', *Felix Ravenna* 12 (1913) pp. 515-17 who argued that the portents listed at the start of c.172 concern 839, 840, 841 and read this chronology back into the previous chapter to reach 838 Cf. F. Patini, 'I Luoghi di Sepultura dei Vescovi Ravennati nel «Liber Pontificalis» di Andrea Agnello' *Felix Ravenna* 98, fasc. 47 (1969) pp. 5-108 at 78-9. Vasina, 'Agnello Andrea', p. 36; Carile, 'Agnello' p. 373 both hedge their bets with c. 837-8. The date of Rotruda's baptism does not affect my analysis.

⁹⁹G. Romano, 'A Proposito di un passo di Agnello Ravennate', *Storia dell' Economia Italiana (Saggi di Storia Economica)* ed. C. M. Cipolla, (Turin, 1959) vol. I pp. 23-8 considers some of the economic and administrative implications of this passage; most recently G. Settia, in *Storia di Pavia* (Milan, 1987) vol. 2, pp. 115f.

¹⁰⁰Agnellus, c. 171, p. 388.

likewise interested in the presence and dress of Charles the Bald and Judith. I shall consider this more fully later. For now I would suggest that perhaps Agnellus saw a parallel between Rotruda, a magnificently-clothed infant female Carolingian, and her mother, the adult archetype for this model. To some extent this is confirmed by Agnellus's description of their clothing. Rotruda's dress is decorated with gold, her *calciamenta* (socks, booties ?) with gold and jacinth. Ermentrude wears gold on her arms, ribbons in her hair, jacinth gems and her face (or figure) was adorned with emeralds and gold. Gold, jacinth and the general magnificence of dress are common to the two descriptions. They are also common to the description of Charles the Bald later who wears 'a ball of fine gold adorned with emeralds and jacinth'. However Charles also wears other objects and clothing obviously concerned with his royal role and the immediate context of battle, perhaps to be understood more as 'male' clothing: a helmet, a spear, a breastplate and a shield.

Agnellus considers Lothar in the next chapter. A series of portents leads up to Louis the Pious's death¹⁰¹, following which Agnellus notes the succession of Lothar as *augustus* to the *maxima pars*, of Louis the German to Bavaria, and of Pippin to Aquitaine. This last is inaccurate since Agnellus claims that *hiis Ermengardae filii [erunt]*. Therefore it is possible that Agnellus was doubly in error; not only was it Pippin II, Ermengard's grandson who succeeded to Aquitaine in 840 (following the death of his father Pippin I in 838, who was indeed a son of Ermengard¹⁰²), but since Agnellus draws no distinction between them, he possibly confused Louis the Pious's wife with Lothar I's wife, both of whom were called Ermengard. Agnellus also noted that Louis the Pious provided for Charles the Bald and married his daughter Gisela to count 'Conrad' (actually Eberhard duke of Friuli.) The picture this presents of Louis the Pious is that of the emperor disposing of his territories as a prelude to death. In this regard it is important that Agnellus

¹⁰¹Cf. Testi-Rasponi, 'Data' pp. 315-17.

¹⁰²On these two rulers B. Schneidmüller, 'Pippin I & 'Pippin II', *Lexikon des Mittelalters* vol. VI (1993), 2170-2.

begins this passage by referring to the emperor's death and then considering his preparations for it. Having described the organization of the succession Agnellus added *eratque pax sed instabilis*, a comment which has been the leitmotiv of 840-1. Then Agnellus's account returned to the activities of George.

Agnellus describes George's effort to gain favour with Lothar. In this section (c. 173) Lothar is almost entirely missing, even though he is the target of George's manoeuvring. The archbishop arranged to travel with the papal *missi* who were attempting to mediate a peace between the Carolingian brothers. Agnellus, to make his position clear, adds that George went *cum maledictione apostolica*. George took with him to Lothar 300 horses, much gold and silver and golden crowns, and gold and gems from broken-up crowns. Agnellus is specific about the purpose of taking all this materiel: he hoped *subvertere imperatorum corda, ut exiret de sub potestate Romano pontificis*.¹⁰³ It was these riches George took to Lothar and about whose subsequent loss Agnellus was so bitter.

The rest of c. 174 concerns the course and outcome of the battle of Fontenoy. Agnellus's account of Lothar's role in the battle is strongly positive. He praises Lothar's bravery, his willingness to plunge into the centre of the fight¹⁰⁴ and comments that if there had been only ten more like him the empire would never have been divided.¹⁰⁵ However this description of Lothar in battle is clearly reliant on other models. Holder-Egger realized this and saw parallels with a line from the *Aeneid*.¹⁰⁶ Certainly Agnellus much-

¹⁰³Agnellus, c. 171, p. 388; Savigni, 'Papi', *SRavenna* II, 2, p. 344.

¹⁰⁴Agnellus, c. 174, ll. 32f. *Lotharius armatus se medium mersit in hostes*.

¹⁰⁵Agnellus, pp. 389-90 c.174 *Qualis in hoste solus, decem sicut ille fuissent, imperium divisum non esset, nec tantos in sedilia reges*. Despite what I say below concerning the influence of other sources on this representation of Lothar it seems difficult to argue that Angelbert's poem on the battle of Fontenoy can have had any influence on Agnellus even though both contain the same topos of victory if more had fought like Lothar. There seem to be no other linguistic similarities between the texts nor does Agnellus use other elements or information from the poem. Perhaps it is just a coincidental use of the same ancient topos. *MGH PLAC* II p. 138 v.4: *Ceteri si sic pugnassent, mox foret victoria*.

¹⁰⁶Agnellus, p. 389, ll. 37-8: *Crinitas sedens sonipede, pictas ornatus faleras ostro...*; cf. *Aeneid* IV, 134 *ostroque insignis et auro stat sonipes*; Holder-Egger, p. 389 n. i.

admired Virgil and elsewhere in the text other lines are modelled on him.¹⁰⁷ Another suggestion is that Agnellus recycled lines and phrases from a now-lost early eighth century verse epic about the revolt of Ravenna against Byzantine rule.¹⁰⁸ He had used phrases from the original earlier in the text in his description of that episode. Brown has doubted this influence, although without going into detail.¹⁰⁹ Whatever the exact truth however, there is a clear consensus that this passage is strongly affected by other literary models. It cannot be used without an awareness of this. The description of Lothar is almost wholly generic. Agnellus deploys the clichés of power drawn from other sources. In this sense Agnellus yet again shows that his interest in the Carolingians is strictly limited to their effect on Ravenna. In this example Lothar's valiant defeat is the prelude to the longer, and for Agnellus far more significant part of the chapter dedicated to the public humiliation of George by Charles the Bald.

Pizarro has drawn attention to Agnellus's emphasis on Charles the Bald's dress understanding it as rhetorical topos related to Charles's inherently royal nature.¹¹⁰ As I hope I have suggested above, except for the account of Ermengard there is no precedent for this in the text. Moreover Pizarro appears to have missed the crucial point that the figure of Charles in Agnellus's account is used to project the author's own opinions. The criticisms expressed by Charles the Bald of George's profligacy and the loss of Ravenna's church treasures are familiar from earlier parts of Agnellus's work. Thus although Agnellus is certainly trying to emphasize the distance between Charles the Bald and George it is to further his local point about George's mismanagement rather than about the nature of royalty. The archbishop grovels at Charles the Bald's feet because he has lost everything

¹⁰⁷Agnellus, p. 384, c. 166, ll. 26-8: *Si ergo idem Spiritus per..gentilium poeta Virgilium..locutus e[s]t...* cf. Aeneid III, 445f; Holder-Egger, p. 384 n. 2; Fasoli, 'Rileggendo' p. 465-6; Brown, 'Campanilismo', pp. 109 & n. 12, p. 113.

¹⁰⁸N. Tamassia & V. Ussani, 'Epica e Storia in Alcuni Capitoli di Agnello Ravennate', *SMI* (1923) pp. 9-40, esp. 31, 16-17; Fasoli, 'Rileggendo', pp. 492-3.

¹⁰⁹Brown, *Gentlemen*, p. 98 n. 34.

¹¹⁰J. Martinez Pizarro, *A Rhetoric of the Scene: Dramatic Narrative in the Early Middle Ages* (Toronto, 1989) pp. 10-13. Cf. J. L. Nelson, *Charles the Bald* (London, 1992) pp. 119, 117.

and not simply because his status and Charles's are different. George's position is a reflection of his failure. Agnellus's description of the Carolingians is therefore that of the victors. It is doubly interesting that Agnellus sees no contradiction in being positive about both Charles the Bald and Lothar. He blames George, not Lothar. Hence Agnellus was probably not in any real sense partisan concerning the fraternal wars of 840-1. Unlike say his contemporary Nithard,¹¹¹ he was not personally committed to any of the Carolingians involved. As ever Agnellus's approach was conditioned by his local concerns, in this case about George.

Lastly I should like to consider the 'prophetic' evidence in the history. It has, probably rightly, been suggested that the prophecies contained in the text function in fact as commentaries on contemporary events.¹¹² They are therefore important in any account of Agnellus's view of the Carolingians. Archbishop Gratosus (it would appear - Agnellus is not always clear about who is prophesying) engaged in a very long prophecy at the end of his *vita* which ranged widely across Arab attacks, the forthcoming disasters for the diocese of Ravenna and a set of statements which probably refer to the division of the Carolingian empire. They cast a sidelight on Agnellus's idea of empire. After prophesying disaster for Ravenna specifically, Gratosus says that the earth will give no fruit and 'that which is now the empire of the Romans will be desolated and kings will sit on the imperial seat'.¹¹³ This line is repeated further on in the prophecy after another broad claim that Christian will fight Christian, there will be blasphemies, and then the Arabs (Agareni) will come from the east and prey on the coastal cities. There will be *inopes reges* in every region and the empire of the Romans and of the Franks will perish and, again, 'kings will sit on the imperial seat'. Worse, these kings will not only be 'useless' but will be oppressors.¹¹⁴ The

¹¹¹J. L. Nelson, 'Public Histories and Private History in the Work of Nithard', *Speculum* 60 (1985), pp. 251-93.

¹¹²Fasoli, 'Rileggendo', p. 469 n. 33; Brown, *Gentlemen*, p. 126.

¹¹³Agnellus, p. 385, c. 166, ll. 14-15: *Et quod nunc est Romanorum imperium desolabitur, et super augustalem solium reges sedebunt.*

¹¹⁴Agnellus, p. 385, c. 166, ll. 27-30. *Nam in cunctis regionibus terrae erunt inopes reges et diligentes munera, et oppriment populus sibi subiectos.*

replacement of the emperor by 'kings' is Agnellus's sole 'political' preoccupation in the prophecy, although he sees other problems flowing from this, most importantly the breakdown of imperial defence. This break-down will be paralleled by a moral break-down in which social barriers collapse and slaves will marry the daughters of their masters. (Agnellus shows himself to regard this as a catastrophe perhaps because of his vaunted noble birth.)¹¹⁵

Gratiosus's prediction is especially full of references to Ravenna's loss of church treasures,¹¹⁶ but it is perhaps precisely because the main target of this clairvoyancy is not the idea of empire that it is revealing about Agnellus's attitude. The distinction between the Roman and Frankish empires is not clearly defined. Possibly Agnellus means Byzantium when he refers to the empire of the Romans but he is not clear. Elsewhere he calls them the Greeks. Possibly he means to posit a link between Rome and the Carolingians but if so he is far from explicit: why first refer to the desolation of the empire of the Romans alone and only afterwards as part of his repetition to that of the Franks?¹¹⁷ It is moreover uncertain how literally the prophecy should be read. It is, after all, at least hypothetically the result of mystic revelation.¹¹⁸ In either case the result for the two empires is the same: the replacement of the emperors by 'kings', who are less competent to provide what Agnellus appears to regard as the prime function of empire, defence. The coming of the Arabs is seen in the light of Christian uncharity and in the decline in the standard of the clergy.¹¹⁹ The performance of the mass will not be acceptable to God unless the priests

¹¹⁵On Agnellus's family Brown, *Gentlemen*, pp. 170-2; attitudes to nobility in the prophecy p. 126. T. J. Heffernann, *Sacred Biography. Saints and their Biographers in the Middle Ages*, (Oxford, 1988) p. 158, completely misunderstands Brown's comments concerning Agnellus's family origins, which are not 'spurious' as Heffernann claims.

¹¹⁶Brown, *Gentlemen*, p. 188.

¹¹⁷Agnellus, c. 166, p. 385 ll. 14-15 & 27-9, op. cit.

¹¹⁸Agnellus, c. 166, p. 384, ll. 15-30, an extended explanation of how the Spirit could fill the speaker: *ego propheta non sum, sed ipse spiritus, qui locutus est in prophetis, potest similiter nostra se effundere corda*.

¹¹⁹Agnellus, p. 386.

renounce greed.¹²⁰ The collapse of empire (that is, its rule by the kings about whom Agnellus is so scathing) permits the Arabs their success. This all implies that Agnellus thought of the empire as a unitary whole which survived and declined together. Of course this might be a result of his Scriptural models (quotations from Joel, Jeremiah, Job, and the Gospels of Luke and John intersperse the text, but interestingly not Revelations) and of the general Roman/Byzantine background but it is also suggestive that Agnellus found it so easy to transfer this type of rhetoric to contemporary conditions. As indicated earlier Agnellus barely mentioned at all the transfer of the imperial title to the Franks but when he did refer to the Frankish empire (and the term is his)¹²¹ he barely drew any distinction between it and its Roman counterpart.¹²² Emperors were distant. The *reges* Agnellus refers to are probably the Carolingian brothers who divided the empire after Fontenoy. To call them useless kings is strident but Agnellus was writing from the particular perspective of their inability to control Arab incursions.

The prophecy appears to postdate the Arab attack on St. Peter's in Rome in 846¹²³ because Agnellus says that Roman *nobiles* will be led away captive to foreign lands and Rome itself will be ravaged and burnt.¹²⁴ There is evidently a sense here of the relationship of empire with Christianity, specifically as the faith's defender (although in the background there is also a certain amount of that rivalry with Rome so evident throughout the text.) But beyond a general understanding of the empire's defensive role it is hard to pick out any coherent theological or political thread in the prophecy (other than an emphasis on the Last Days). Agnellus's conception of empire links the institution naturally to Christianity

¹²⁰Agnellus, p. 386 c. 166 l. 2-3. *Sacrificium autem non Deo placabile erit, si perfecte huius seculi cupiditas sacerdos [non] abiciatur.*

¹²¹Agnellus, p. 385 c. 166 l. 29: *Francorum imperium.*

¹²²Agnellus, p. 385, c. 166, l. 29. *Peribit Romanorum Francorum imperium.* Cf. Brown, 'Interplay', p. 157.

¹²³LP vol. II ed. Duchesne, pp. 97-9; P. Llewellyn, *Rome in the Dark Ages*, (London, 2nd edn. 1993), pp. 262-3.

¹²⁴Agnellus, p. 385, ll. 36-37 *..et vadent nobiles Romani in aliena terra captivi propter suas divitias. Depopulabitur a suis Roma et cuncremata incendio erit...*

but it is doubtful whether Agnellus could have imagined anything else. Similarly Agnellus's political ideas (such as they are) seem unlikely to have been the product of Carolingian propaganda but rather the product of the common Roman/Byzantine ideological heritage which the Carolingians had adopted.

This attempt to consider the evidence Agnellus provides about the Carolingians has yielded in some respects a rather bland account. Agnellus the ferocious xenophobe¹²⁵ has somewhat softened. This is not to say Agnellus liked outsiders, only that he displays no overt antipathy to the Carolingians - but nor does he show much enthusiasm either. His world view really is so narrowly-focused that he refracts everything through the lens of Ravenna. His references to the Carolingians are very few in comparison to the length of the text. He refrains from making value judgements. On the whole he seems quite impressed by those Carolingians of his own day. He certainly recognizes their power and importance. But that doesn't alter his approach to his history which is about his city, its see and clergy. In this the Carolingians are no more than occasional players.

Andreas of Bergamo: Unlike most of our other texts (except for the *HLCG* and the *libellus* [below]) the chronicle of Andreas of Bergamo at least attempts to describe more than just the history of a region or institution.¹²⁶ Although of modest size Andreas's chronicle is the longest surviving historical work from Carolingian north Italy between Agnellus of Ravenna and Liutprand of Cremona.¹²⁷ It is not complete but breaks off at the end of 877, mid-sentence. It is not known how much is missing. Conventional datings of the text depend on three key pieces of evidence. Firstly, Andreas records that he carried Louis II's body across the territory of Bergamo which makes the author a contemporary and places the text in the late ninth or early tenth century. Secondly, the last event actually described in the work is the death of Charles the Bald (Oct. 6, 877). Thirdly, that the text survives in a late ninth- or early tenth-century manuscript; in this manuscript a 'late ninth-

¹²⁵Brown, 'Campanilismo', p. 108.

¹²⁶*Andreae Bergomatis Historiae*, ed. G. Waitz, *MGH SS SRL*, pp. 220-230.

¹²⁷Löwe, *DG IV* p. 404.

century' hand continues the narrative just where our text ends,¹²⁸ implying that this is as much of the work as was known to the continuator. It is therefore generally stated that Andreas was probably writing soon after i.e. c.877/8.¹²⁹

The text has been the subject of a certain amount of interest from scholars, most of whom have thought little of it. These studies have almost always been either short articles or just a few pages of general works in which Andreas has been relegated to a minor role. Much-criticized, Andreas has never been the subject of a study in his own right. The principal criticisms against Andreas concern the barbarity of his Latin,¹³⁰ the narrowness of his provincial outlook,¹³¹ the absence of independent historical information in the chronicle and its confused chronology. I shall deal with some of these points later. In general however historians' disappointment in the chronicle seems to stem from its failure to live up to standards drawn from other historical works. It seems more sensible to assess the work on its own merits rather than by attempting to judge it by its adherence to some other model which, as far as can be judged, the author himself never adopted. The picture which emerges from a close reading of Andreas is rather different from that generally presented.

¹²⁸B. Bischoff, 'Italienische Handschriften des neunten bis elften Jahrhunderts in frühmittelalterlichen Bibliotheken ausserhalb Italiens', *Il Libro e il Testo*, eds. C. Questa & R. Raffaelli, (Atti del Convegno Internazionale; Urbino, 1982), pp. 171-90 at 178. There is also a twelfth-century copy of this manuscript at St. Gall. See below ch. III pp. 120f. for further discussion.

¹²⁹This date first appears in L. Bethmann, 'Die Geschichtsschreibung der Langobarden', *Archiv [der Gesellschaft für ältere deutsche Geschichtskunde]* X, 2 (1849) pp. 335-414 at 367-8 and has been repeated ever since: M. G. Bertolini, 'Andreas di Bergamo', *DBI* 4 (1966) pp. 79-80 at 80; E. Ebenbauer, *Grundriss der Romanischen Literaturen des Mittelalters*, vol. IX, I, i (La Littérature Historiographique des Origines à 1500, Heidelberg, 1986) p. 104.

¹³⁰Bethmann, 'Ueber den Sprachgebrauch des *Chronicon Casinense* und des Andreas Presbyter von Bergamo', *Archiv* IX (1847) pp. 659-72 is a philological, grammatical and orthographical analysis of these two texts considering some of their peculiarities works e.g. Andreas's use of the genitive in place of the nominative p. 667. He repeats his negative judgement more concisely in 'Geschichtsschreibung' p. 368 but also concedes the work's importance. For the barbarity of Andreas's Latin see also: U. Balzani, *Le cronache italiane nel medio evo* (Milan, 1909, 3rd edn.); F. Crosara, 'Rex Langobardiae - Rex Italiae: note in margine alla «Historia» di Andrea di Bergamo', *Atti [del 2 Congresso di Studi sull' Alto Medioevo]* (1952) pp.155-80 at 179; ed. Löwe, *DG* IV p. 403; Bertolini, 'Andreas', p. 80.

¹³¹Th. Körner 'Andreas v. Bergamo', *Lexikon des Mittelalters* vol. I p. 603; C. G. Mor, 'La Storiografia Italiana del sec. IX da Andrea di Bergamo ad Erchemperto', *Atti*, p. 241 is critical of Italian ninth century historical writing in general on this account.

It is true that Andreas's Latin is not schoolroom perfect,¹³² but then one of the points of interest of Andreas's work is that it is manifestly not the product of a highly-educated and politically-literate court elite, unlike so many other Carolingian works (e.g. *AB* by Prudentius and Hincmar). Similar criticisms used to be levelled at Agnellus of Ravenna's Latinity but more recently philologists have come to value Agnellus's language for itself and for what it reveals about the contemporary vernacular.¹³³ Such a re-evaluation is probably overdue for Andreas too. Moreover it is unreasonable to expect Ciceronian exactitude in a ninth century text.

The question of the narrowness of his provincial outlook is more puzzling. Andreas's main emphasis lies on the political vicissitudes of the Carolingian empire and in particular the Italian part of it. He concentrates in the main on the great political figures of his times and the core of his narrative revolves around the doings of the Carolingian rulers themselves, particularly Louis II. Admittedly Andreas's information is sometimes scanty and the further back one goes the less sure is his grasp of detail but it is hard to see him as a 'provincial' given that the main bulk of his history is concerned with the 'international' history of the Carolingians. He includes accounts of the drawing-in of the Franks into Italian affairs in the mid-8th century (the least reliable section of the chronicle), Bernard's death, the fraternal wars of the 840s, Louis II's campaigns in southern Italy against the Arabs and of the manoeuvrings following Louis's death. He even manages to embrace the conversion of the Bulgars to Christianity¹³⁴ and a small amount of information concerning the internal organisation of the empire, such as the installation of the Unruochings in Friuli. This is not to say that Andreas is a good or always reliable historian but to criticize him as narrow seems misplaced. By comparison with, say, Agnellus of Ravenna, Andreas

¹³²Bertolini, 'Andreas', p. 80.

¹³³J. M. Pizarro, *Writing Ravenna: the Liber Pontificalis of Andreas Agnellus* (Michigan, 1995), pp. 23-4 & n. 42.

¹³⁴Andreas, c.13, p. 227.

had wide political interests¹³⁵ and although he did include some information obviously of local interest (such as his and the bishop of Bergamo's involvement in the transfer of Louis II's body or the devastation of the Bergamo region by supporters of Louis the German's bid to become emperor in 876) these incidents are recorded only as details in a much bigger picture. In better-known works local colour is valued.¹³⁶ Andreas is provincial only in the sense that he was not at court. Indeed to respond to the comment that Carolingian rulers of Italy seem to have made little impression on the people of Italy¹³⁷ one would comment that in Andreas's work there is, by contrast, little else. The absence of much detail concerning the earlier Carolingians may be due to ignorance,¹³⁸ but might also be interpreted as an indication that Andreas realized that in the period before Louis II Italian-Lombard affairs were dominated by decisions and ambitions directed from, and to, north of the Alps.

Criticism of Andreas's grasp of chronology is also misplaced as attention to the structure¹³⁹ of his work reveals. Clearly there is no rigid overall plan based on a classical model (like Einhard's use of Suetonius for example). But the history is not haphazard. It is at the most basic level, essentially chronological, but beyond this I believe the surviving text is loosely arranged into four principal sections, although this may not have been conscious but simply followed the pattern of the events Andreas recounts. The opening segment, the longest in the whole text amounting to nearly one quarter of its length, is an epitome of Paul the Deacon's *Historia Langobardorum*.¹⁴⁰ It is followed by a passage in which Andreas introduces himself and modestly apologizes for his lack of skill in

¹³⁵Although Agnellus had more general interests in art and inscriptions etc. his view was solely Ravenna-centred: see e.g. Brown, 'Campanilismo', *passim*.

¹³⁶Indeed such local colour can be highly instructive e.g. *The Annals of St. Bertin*, transl. J.L. Nelson, p. 138 and n. 3, a. 867 notes Hincmar's disputes with the Papacy or p. 161 and n. 19, a. 869 on the see of Rheims's claim to have some of the divine oil used in Clovis's baptism.

¹³⁷C. J. Wickham, *Early Medieval Italy*, pp. 50-1.

¹³⁸C. J. Wickham, 'Lawyers Time: History and Memory in Tenth- and Eleventh-century Italy', eds. H. Mayr-Harting & R. I. Moore, *Studies in Medieval History Presented to R. H. C. Davis*, (London, 1985), pp. 53-72, at 57 claims that 'we can guess that...Andreas wrote down more or less all he knew'.

¹³⁹Pertz divided the text into twenty unequal chapters (*MGH SS RL* p. 221, ll. 14-16).

¹⁴⁰Andreas, pp. 221, ll. 17f.- 223, l. 25.

comparison to Paul.¹⁴¹ This interjection indicates the point at which his 'formed' sources ran out and he was compelled to undertake the task of writing history without the aid of a more reliable and polished authority. In effect it marks the end of the text's 'introduction' and the start of Andreas's own account.

This epitome of the *Historia Langobardorum* is crucial to understanding Andreas's conception of history which informs, perhaps subconsciously, the rest of the work. The opening epitome is a basically reliable summary of the *HL*'s account of the history of the *regnum langobardorum* except that Andreas entirely omits any reference to the duchies of Spoleto and Benevento, both of which play an important part in Paul the Deacon's text.¹⁴² The only exception is Grimoald of Benevento's establishment as king, although this again seems to be included only because it was part of the northern *regnum*'s history. The last line of the account of Grimoald's reign reveals that Andreas was deliberately limiting what he included in his epitome: *Multa quidem eius storiola* [i.e the *Historia Langobardorum*] *continet, sed pauca in hac adbreuiationem conscribam*.¹⁴³ Clearly therefore he was selecting his material, I think purposefully. As in the epitome the rest of Andreas's work concerning the years after 774 similarly omits both Spoleto and Benevento except for Louis II's campaigns in the south. Andreas never considers Benevento part of the Lombard world and he refers to it in the same way that he refers to other south Italian areas. Spoleto simply doesn't feature. If we accept, as Andreas clearly intended us to, that this work is superficially a continuation of Paul the Deacon's *Historia Langobardorum* it is nevertheless equally clear that Andreas did not share Paul the Deacon's definition of his field.¹⁴⁴ Andreas is based on a very different conception of Lombard history, one which is not ethnic but royal. For Andreas history was of the deeds of kings. As I hope to indicate

¹⁴¹Andreas, c. 2, p. 223.

¹⁴²Cf. Goffart, *Narrators*, pp. 382-423 *passim* for some good comments, esp. e.g. 414.

¹⁴³Andreas, p. 223, ll. 1-5.

¹⁴⁴Bullough, 'Ethnic History', pp. 99-101 regards the *Historia Langobardorum* as 'ethnic history', and regards many of its 'ethnological passages [as]...designed to illustrate some feature of the *gens*.'

below this idea perfectly explains Andreas's account of the *regnum Langobardorum* after 774, which is basically about the Carolingians.

Cc.3-11 are essentially a chronological account of the history of the *regnum langobardorum* and the events in the Carolingian empire which affected it from c.744-850. This second section can be characterized as a report of 'internal affairs'. It describes the developing relationship between Papacy and Carolingians, the conquest of the Lombards, their incorporation into the Frankish world and the convolutions of Carolingian family history in so far as they impinged upon Italy. Since what happened in Italy was often decided by events elsewhere naturally Andreas turns in this section to a description of the frictions within the Carolingian family itself, viz. Bernard's death (which Andreas significantly does *not* appear to consider a Lombard 'national' revolt¹⁴⁵) Louis the Pious's falling out with Lothar and the wars which followed in the 840s. Andreas places his brief reference to Lombard troubles at the hands of the Slavs in this section of his text because it appears to have involved Slav incursions into Friuli and because it led to the installation of Unruoch as duke of Friuli, both 'domestic' matters. [see below]

After this in cc. 12-16 Andreas deals with 'foreign affairs'. This segment of the history deals almost exclusively with Louis II's campaigns in southern Italy but the characterisation of 'foreign affairs' is justified by Andreas's inclusion of a description of the conversion of the Bulgars. The key point is that this section deals with those outside the Carolingian territories (relations with those who are *extera gentes* ?). Again note that, despite Louis II's activities in the south, Andreas therefore considers the Beneventans outside the Carolingian empire. This would appear to be a continuation of the views of the *HLCG*.¹⁴⁶ (This also affects the idea that Andreas was writing 'Lombard' history.¹⁴⁷)

¹⁴⁵Although T. F. X. Noble, 'The Revolt of King Bernard', *Studi Medievali* n.s. XV (1974), pp. 315-26 provided the first detailed criticism of the 'Lombard nationalist' approach to 817, the idea was first proposed briefly in E. Sestan, *Stato e Nazione nell'Alto Medioevo*, (Naples, 1952), pp. 346-9; cf. Crosara, 'Note' p. 179.

¹⁴⁶See above p. 35 n. 31.

¹⁴⁷On Andreas as a Lombard historian below ch. III, p. 124.

Andreas also says nothing about the Byzantines even when this would have been appropriate in his description of Louis II's campaigns.¹⁴⁸ Lastly in cc.17-20 Andreas deals with Louis's death, the portents of it and the struggle for the imperial crown afterwards. This section is incomplete and Andreas's purpose is uncertain.

A consideration of these rough divisions within the text of the history resolves most of the problems of chronology of which so many commentators have been critical. Admittedly in some of the early sections where Andreas was forced to make his own way, he makes some appalling errors believing that Carloman, Charlemagne's younger brother was blinded after rebelling. However Andreas's chronology of the later period is generally quite sound. Where events are taken out of chronological order this can usually be explained by literary structure. In c.6 Bernard's death of early 818 is placed before Louis the Pious's 817 division of the empire amongst his three sons.¹⁴⁹ However this seems more like a literary stratagem than an error in chronology. First Andreas deals with the story of Bernard right down to its tragic finale, then he returns to the issue of the inheritance. This technically overturns the chronology of events but makes perfect sense. Andreas is merely pursuing one topic to its conclusion.

Andreas does this at many points in his text. In c.7 he deals with the events of the 840s and 850s concerning Lothar's division of his kingdoms but pursues this theme to include the deaths of Charles of Provence in 863 and of Lothar II in 869. Again I would suggest that this is not a failure of chronology but rather the consistent pursuit of one topic to its conclusion. It is therefore not incompatible with this scheme to return later (in c.9), having established Charles of Provence's death, to events in the region before Lothar II's death which was only included in c.7 because it followed on naturally from that of his younger brother. The same can be said of Andreas's return to 850 in c.12 because he is dealing in this chapter, the opening chapter of the the foreign affairs section, with campaigns against

¹⁴⁸Mor, 'Storiografia' p. 241 levels this same criticism at Erchempert. Cf. Taviani-Carozzi, *Salerno*, pp. 59-60.

¹⁴⁹Andreas, p. 225, c. 6.

the Arabs. As long as one does not expect Andreas to be *strictly* chronological the structure of his history makes perfect sense.

Andreas has much to say about the Carolingians specifically. He records correctly Charlemagne's intention to marry Desiderius's daughter as one of a set of marriages designed to establish peaceable relations between Desiderius, Charlemagne and Tassilo of Bavaria; but Andreas comments wryly that these rulers *pax firmissima ex utraque partis firmaverunt, sed minime conservaverunt*. The cause of this failure however was attributed to Charlemagne's *germanus maior* (actually his younger brother) Carloman. Carloman was, in the best traditions of Carolingian historiography, *ferebundus et pessimus*.¹⁵⁰ Andreas claims Carloman revolted against Charlemagne in order to block the marriage alliance with Desiderius's daughter. Although there is no other evidence for this it is not entirely implausible: there was friction between the two brothers and if the marriage went ahead Carloman risked being encircled.

The rest of Charlemagne's reign is only half-understood. Immediately after his account of Carloman's death (771) Andreas states that *his temporibus* pope Leo ruled the Roman church and was much-oppressed by the Lombards. The pope in question can hardly be other than Leo III who only ascended the Papal throne in 795 so Andreas's *his temporibus* as a chronological indicator is very loose; and Leo was certainly not active at the time of Carloman's death. Leo's greatest achievement in the text is cultural. Andreas relates that the pope *ex sed propria exiens Francia, repetavit cum multis sapientissimis ars litterarum, maxime cantores*. As a result the Franks were *magno gavisi gaudio*.¹⁵¹ Charlemagne met the singers on foot and established them in Metz where they remained for three years. Thus Rome provided both Frankia and Italy [sic] with singers who *multe civitates ornamentum aecclesiae usque hodie consonant*.¹⁵² Although Metz was a great

¹⁵⁰Andreas, p. 223, ll. 37-41.

¹⁵¹Andreas, p. 224, ll. 6-8.

¹⁵²Andreas, p. 224, ll. 10-11. Waitz, Andreas, p. 224 n. 2 suggests the episode is related to Paul the Deacon's *Liber de episcopis Mettensibus*, ed. G. Pertz, *MGH SS II*, pp. 260-8 at 268 although I fail to see the similarity.

musical centre Andreas has radically simplified the history of the arrival of Roman musicians in Frankia; it was neither Leo nor Charlemagne alone who played the crucial role in bringing Roman chant across the Alps.¹⁵³

But Leo's achievements were not only liturgical. Having assessed the Franks as *astuti et nobiles* he, presumably mindful of the pressure the Lombards were exerting in Italy, advised them that they might conquer Italy. Charlemagne gathered his *fideles*. Andreas reveals here a little ambivalence about the Frankish king for he *oblitus est tantorum benignitatis quod ei Desiderus rex tribuit*.¹⁵⁴ Andreas's account of the actual conquest is completely practical. It was a *multorum Francorum exercitum* which carried out the campaign. Andreas adds that as a preliminary *ex issu apostolici sacramenta irrita facta sunt*.¹⁵⁵ No earlier oath is referred to in the text but perhaps Andreas means to indicate that the peace which was 'little conserved'¹⁵⁶ was supposed to have been sealed with an oath. That the oath was erased by Papal order may be an attempt to shift the blame onto the Papacy for an event about which Andreas is obviously somewhat ambivalent. Pope Leo was after all the one who encouraged the Franks to take Italy. The giving of oaths is a repeated theme in Andreas's text. With the spiritual decks cleared the Franks attacked Italy and *divino iudicio terror in Langubardus inruit, absque gravis pugna Italiam invasit*.¹⁵⁷ As with his description of the size of the army there was no Frankish heroism here.¹⁵⁸ The Frankish conquest is confirmed in the text by the neutral description of Desiderius's death (*Desiderio vero eodem tempore mortuus est*) and by the flight overseas of his son and co-ruler Adelchis.¹⁵⁹ For Andreas the Lombard kingdom was ended with its monarchy.

¹⁵³For an account see S. Rankin, 'Carolingian Music', ed. R. McKitterick, *Carolingian Culture*, (Cambridge, 1994), pp. 274-316 at 275-6.

¹⁵⁴Andreas, p. 224, ll. 14-15.

¹⁵⁵Andreas, p. 224, ll. 15-16.

¹⁵⁶Andreas, p. 223, ll. & above p. 62.

¹⁵⁷Andreas, p. 224, ll. 16-17. Cf *ARF* a. 773, which likewise emphasizes the ease with which Italy was captured.

¹⁵⁸Cf. on the other hand *ARF* a. 773; esp. Einhard, *VKM*, c. 6.

¹⁵⁹Andreas, p. 224, ll. 19-20. Andreas shows Adelchis's status as co-ruler by dating 774 by the regnal years of both Desiderius and Adelchis: Andreas, p. 229, ll. 17-18.

This point was reiterated in one of the best known passages in Andreas concerning the fierce resistance put up by the Friulan Lombards, lead by dukes Rotgaud of Friuli and Gaidus of Vicenza. They eventually withdrew because of the advice offered by one of their number (who was hardly disinterested since he was someone *cui iam munera Caroli exceccaverat cor.*) His justification for them laying down their arms however reprises Andreas's view of history: *Quid faciemus ? Quomodo eorum resistere possumus ? Capud non habemus. Regem confortationis nostrae, iam devictus est.*¹⁶⁰ It is striking indeed that in Andreas's view it is not that the Lombards were fought to a standstill but that they accepted that they could not fight on without a king. The *regnum* equalled the *rex*. As confirmation of the defeat Andreas concludes that these 'irreducibili' Friulan Lombards *Carolus servavit honorem*. They are thus reincorporated into a historical scheme based around the monarchy.

Andreas then provides a thumbnail sketch of how the conquest of Lombard Italy was consolidated. Charlemagne having *subiugata et ordinata Italia, ad Romam perrexit* where he built a palace,¹⁶¹ perhaps a symbolic assertion of control over Italy and a reminder of the Franko-Papal alliance. *Deinde terra pacificata et sacramenta data, Pipinus suus filius, regendum Italia concessit.*¹⁶² Note again the casual reference to an oath. Andreas clearly means this to be understood as an oath required immediately from the conquered territories.¹⁶³ Andreas also reports that Charlemagne took two hundred hostages back to Frankia with him, probably to be associated with similar references from other sources, although the dating is slightly uncertain.¹⁶⁴ However plausible these reports may sound they must be treated with caution given his considerable confusion about this period. However his opinion about Charlemagne's status as a great ruler is unmistakeable: *per*

¹⁶⁰Andreas, p. 224, ll. 27-30.

¹⁶¹Recorded in several other sources: C. R. Brühl, 'Die Kaiserpfalz bei St. Peter und die Pfalz Ottos III auf dem Palatin', *QF* 34 (1954), pp. 1-30 at 6 calls this 'eine städtrömische Tradition', but how might Andreas have come to know it ?

¹⁶²Andreas, p. 224, ll. 32-4.

¹⁶³Thus Manacorda, *Ricerche*, p. 36 although the passage he cites claiming it is from Andreas c.5 is not.

¹⁶⁴*Annales Guelferbytani*, *MGH SS I*, p. 43, a. 787; Manacorda, *Ricerche*, p. 62.

eum nomen Francorum longe lateque percrebuit, sicut est nunc usque ad hodiernum diem.

Andreas's account of Bernard's reign has attracted comment. It has often been characterized as an 'Italian' version of events. In fact it does not explicitly say that Bernard revolted at all. I suspect the key to Andreas's version of 817 lies in his view of the victor rather than the vanquished. Andreas thinks well of both Bernard and Louis the Pious. Louis follows Charlemagne and strangely is recorded as the first of the *Francorum genus* to be called emperor.¹⁶⁵ He is not attributed responsibility for Bernard's death. On the contrary Andreas endows Louis with a fairly standard set of ruler's virtues: Louis *erat imperator...multae sapientiae, consilio prudens, misericors et pacis amator; habebat tranquillitas magna ex omniumque parte pacis gratia*.¹⁶⁶ All his descriptions of the emperor consistently emphasized Louis as a peaceful and a peace-making ruler. When Louis dies Andreas notes that 'he finished his days in peace'.¹⁶⁷ The account of this 'merciful' and peace-loving emperor may be designed to contrast with the fraternal wars which followed.¹⁶⁸ Louis the Pious's peaceful reign retrospectively received a good press in comparison to the 840s.

In Andreas Louis's wife, Ermengard, gets the blame for Bernard's death; apparently Andreas followed the 'official' explanation of 817-18.¹⁶⁹ Jarnut has made a version of Andreas's account the centrepiece of his analysis of Bernard's revolt: he considers that she may have arranged a safe conduct for Bernard to visit Louis's when he was seized.¹⁷⁰ This is an interesting idea partially supported by Andreas's claim that *ille* [Bernard] *ad sacramenta fidem suscepit*. However considering the flaws in Andreas's account of the events of 817 one should not lay too much emphasis on his statements. The text attributes

¹⁶⁵Andreas, p. 225, ll. 2-3.

¹⁶⁶Andreas, p. 225, c. 6, ll. 9-10.

¹⁶⁷Andreas, c. 7, p. 226, ll. 16: *...suosque dies finivit in pace*.

¹⁶⁸Andreas, p. 226, ll. 17f., & below p. 66.

¹⁶⁹See K. F. Werner, '*Hludovicus Augustus*: Gouverner l'Empire Chrétien', eds. P. Godman & R. Collins, *Charlemagne's Heir*, (Oxford, 1990), pp. 43f. takes Ermengard's responsibility very seriously.

¹⁷⁰Jarnut, 'Bernhard', pp. 643-4.

Ermengard with *inimicitia* towards Bernard and putting out his eyes without the emperor's knowledge. The closest Andreas gets to Jarnut's version is the statement that the Ermengard *quasi pacis gratia ad se venire*. Indeed Andreas does not report that Bernard rebelled at all. His death is presented solely as the result of a deceit driven by Ermengard's hostility. He even claims that it happened in Francia.¹⁷¹

Lothar I's rebellion against his father is also reported quite fully. In Andreas's phrasing Louis established *filium suum Lothario sub se sedem imperialis*. There is no question but that Lothar was subordinate. The future Louis II is recorded here being conceded *Italia* by Louis the Pious, along with Louis the German who received 'Bavaria', and Charles who got Aquitaine;¹⁷² here Andreas has read back the situation which prevailed after 840 to what is probably supposed to represent the *ordinatio imperii* of 817. (This is particularly strange since he also narrates the fraternal wars of the 840s which brought about the arrangement he describes [see below].) Neither Louis II nor Charles the Bald were even alive in 817, although Andreas is probably correct to claim that Louis the Pious granted Italy to his grandson, but not until 838/9.¹⁷³ Andreas thus implies that Lothar and Louis the Pious were joint-emperors while the three sub-rulers governed regions of the empire. Lothar 'advised by evil men' *quatenus Iulitta [sic]...genitori suo tollerent et in Italia adducerent; sicuti fecerunt*. Louis's anger was terrific and after 'not many days' Lothar ^{released} Judith and turned against those *qui ei tam pravam consilium dederunt, alios occidit, alios in exilio misit*. (One wonders if this was the post-factum explanation for the rebellion and, even more so, for the unexpected rapprochement between Lothar and Judith which resulted in the 839 deal.¹⁷⁴)

Another aspect of Andreas's attitude towards Louis is suggested by the first half of his description of the emperor as possessed of 'much wisdom, prudent in counsel'. Andreas

¹⁷¹Since before his death Bernard *Francia iturus est*: Andreas, p. 225, l. 6.

¹⁷²Andreas, p. 225, ll. 14-16.

¹⁷³Louis the Pious's donation is recorded on Louis II's epitaph: see below ch. IV, p. 156.

¹⁷⁴*Annals of St. Bertin*, trans. J. L. Nelson, (Manchester, 1991), a. 839, pp. 44-6; *ibid.* *Charles the Bald*, pp. 98-100.

records the reconciliation of Lothar and Louis the Pious in 837-9 via the intervention of Angilbert archbishop of Milan. Angilbert visited Lothar (presumably in Italy) where his exaggerated compliment to the metropolitan (*quasi sanctus Ambrosius sis !*) was met by a stern rebuke *nec ego sanctus Ambrosius[sum], nec tu dominus Deus [es]*. This anecdote presumably established Angilbert's humility and independence of mind. Lothar then asked Angilbert to go to Louis the Pious *cuius odium me fecistis habere; reducite me ad prisitnam gratiam*.¹⁷⁵ When Louis met Angilbert the emperor, evidently thinking of his eldest son, questioned whether he had to forgive even those who had done him wrong and eventually accepted Angilbert's scriptural response that he did if he wished to receive eternal life.¹⁷⁶ Louis's initial resistance was overcome because he listened to the wise advice offered him by the metropolitan and re-established peace with his son. Significantly the author chooses to use the phrase that Louis *gratiam filii sui reddidit*. The linguistic ties within Andreas's account thus bind together all of the aspects of his image of Louis: the emperor loved peace, in his reign the grace of peace was abundant and in the end he re-established his son in his grace, (the grace of peace). Peace arose from Louis's wise acceptance of ecclesiastical guidance, hence Andreas's positive description of Louis.¹⁷⁷

After Louis's death *discordia* immediately arose between his three surviving heirs. Andreas recounts the political alliances solely in terms of the brothers who survived to rule kingdoms later, that is Charles the Bald, Louis the German and Lothar I. Since *nulla parte dantes locum* they came to battle at Fontenoy (as Andreas himself recalls) and *facta est strages magna, maxime nobiles Aquitanorum*. The grave effects of this are such that even in Andreas's time *sic discipata [sic] est nobilitas Aquitanorum quae etiam Nortemanni eorum possedant terrae, nec est eorum fortia qui resistat*.¹⁷⁸ Louis the Pious's death thus triggered events of lasting damage in comparison to the peaceful years of his rule.

¹⁷⁵Andreas, p. 225, ll. 24-31.

¹⁷⁶Andreas, pp. 225, ll. 24f.- 226, l. 7, c.7.

¹⁷⁷I am grateful to Paul Kershaw for discussing this passage.

¹⁷⁸Andreas, p. 226, ll. 17-25, quotation from 23-5.

Andreas was poorly informed about the details of various inheritance plans. He does not appear to have known about Pippin I or Pippin II of Aquitaine because they are not mentioned. Only three sons of Louis the Pious are recorded. Only those who outlived the emperor and succeeded to their own kingdoms are mentioned in the text. Andreas likewise records that Lothar had three sons who succeeded him.¹⁷⁹ This might be deliberate but probably reflects the state of his knowledge; of Charlemagne's sons Andreas mentions only Pippin of Italy and Louis the Pious. Andreas pursues his description of Lothar I's heirs by noting in swift succession the deaths of Charles of Provence (incorrectly recorded as *non post multos dies*)¹⁸⁰ and Lothar II [see above]. Lothar II's death after his trip to Italy is associated with the fact that he *multa devastantes pauperorum domibus, blasphemiam multa incurrit*. Many of his men suffered a like fate.¹⁸¹

Andreas then concludes his 'domestic' reports with two which he appears to believe relate to regions of the empire. Andreas's account of the activity of Hubert, lay abbot of St. Maurice d'Agaune is somewhat unusual. Hubert is depicted as a rebel who drew other 'Burgundians' into a rebellion which was then swiftly crushed by Louis II, acting through the medium of count Conrad. The events surrounding Hubert's death are complex, certainly more so than Andreas suggests, and not strictly relevant here¹⁸² but the key point is that Andreas represented Hubert's activities as a rebellion against Louis which the emperor was able to deal with effectively by the deployment of a senior noble. Andreas, as in the sections concerning Louis's campaigns against the Arabs, certainly did not think of Louis as a 'straw man'.¹⁸³ The establishment of Eberhard of Friuli as *princeps* of that region concludes his political reports. [See below] Lastly in this section there are meteorological reports concerning heavy snowfalls and intense cold.¹⁸⁴

¹⁷⁹Andreas, p. 226, ll. 25f.

¹⁸⁰Andreas, p. 226, l. 28.

¹⁸¹Andreas, p. 226, ll. 28-33.

¹⁸²Cf. AB, a. 864, p. 74 & *Annals of St. Bertin*, trans. Nelson, p. 121, nn. 32-4 with refs. I hope to treat this in detail elsewhere.

¹⁸³J.R.R. Maddicott's admittedly partial characterization in *Past & Present* 135 (May 1992) p.164.

¹⁸⁴Andreas, p. 227, ll. 5-11.

Andreas now deals with foreign affairs, principally Louis II's campaigns in the south. He is personally regarded by Andreas as *multa quidem oppressionem a Saracenorum gens in finibus Beneventanis sustinuit et eorum semper resistit*. He is recorded killing Amelmasser, the Saracen *princeps*, and besieging Arab Bari for five years with the *Franci* and *Longobardi*, although no effort is made to distinguish these groups. Louis's personal responsibility for fighting the Arabs is taken for granted by Andreas. Andreas draws no chronological distinction between the campaigns above, which Waitz suggests are those of 850, and the next reports concerning 870-1. However he sandwiches an at first sight curiously-positioned report about the conversion of the Bulgars between these two passages. Yet again the crucial factor in this episode is royal action. Although it is in the *Vulgarorum gens* that *divina aspiracio accensa est*, the key (fictional) event is that the king of the Bulgars visited Rome and obtained baptism and advisers from pope Nicholas I.¹⁸⁵ However the purpose of the passage is probably to introduce the series of Christian successes which follow. It is also possible that Andreas intends the reader to recall the Bulgars' role as ancient enemies of the Lombards; Andreas's epitome of Paul the Deacon includes the notice that the Lombards defeated the Bulgars in battle but also that after this victory *Langobardi audatiores effecti sunt*.¹⁸⁶ Although the Lombards had yet to be evangelized when they triumphed over the Bulgars Andreas thus provides an echo of legendary successes and introduces the Christian theme which underlies what follows. The intrusion of the Bulgars into again history presages military victory, this time overlain with a religious theme.

Louis was approached by *nuncii* from 'Calabria' [sic] who requested that he come and *des nos caput confortacionis, qui nos adiuvent et confortent*. Andreas again uses a phrase very similar to that deployed concerning the Friulan Lombards in 776: the ruler is the head and comfort of his people. effective action is only possible with such a leader. Further,

¹⁸⁵ Andreas, p. 227, ll. 18-23, c. 6.

¹⁸⁶ Andreas, p. 221, ll. 32-37. Cf. Paul the Deacon, *Historia Langobardorum*, I, 17.

pursuing again his interest in oath-giving Andreas has these 'Calabrians' promise Louis that *sacramenta vobis damus, tributa solvimus*. This will formalize the relationship. However the emperor *miser cordia motus, non gaudens cupiditatis eorum promissa, sed de illorum malitia dolens*¹⁸⁷ appointed *strenuis et nobilissimis viris* (including a certain *Hotone de finibus Bergomenisis*, perhaps the source of the story) to campaign in the south. Louis couched his response to the 'Calabrians' in terms of common Christian faith: *ite in pace, fideles Christi...* Louis's emissaries acquire the necessary oaths and then attack the Saracens who are holding Christian captives. The *Christiani inruentes super illos, et Saraceni quanti ibi invenerunt occiderunt, captivi liberaverunt*. They were then joined by a local *princeps*, Cincimus of Amantea, [see below] and a great slaughter of the Arabs ensued. The imperial emissaries returned as *triumphatores* and were greatly honoured by Louis.

In the follow-up to this event Andreas recounts that the Saracens planned to attack the Christians while they, in their *simplicitate*, were celebrating Christmas. But Louis was warned. He undertook spiritual and liturgical preparations, all the bishops and priests celebrating mass, offering a blessing and the *populus* taking communion.¹⁸⁸ Andreas's impressionistic but striking description of the battle sets the scene for the decisive passage where the Christians draw together (*prope se coniungerent*) and pray, using the words of John's Gospel.¹⁸⁹ Perhaps in an echo of that comfort the ruler offered, so *arma celestis confortavit Christianos*.¹⁹⁰ The *pagani* [sic] fled the field and the following hear those who escaped were captured when Bari fell.

The Saracens launch a last counter-attack in Andreas's text. They gather perhaps as many as twenty thousand men and land in the *finibus Beneventana*. But *per suorum audaciae elationis* they decided to divide their forces because *Franci adversos nos nihil*

¹⁸⁷ Andreas, p. 228, ll. 24-30. This is an interesting reversal of Erchempert's portrayal of the Franks as greedy: below ch. III, n. 76.

¹⁸⁸ Andreas, p. 228, ll. 1-9.

¹⁸⁹ Andreas, p. 228, ll. 11-14. Battle description: ll. 10-11.

¹⁹⁰ Andreas, p. 228, l. 15.

possunt. Thus when the Frankish leaders, Unroch of Friuli, Boso and Agefrid attacked them with a hand-picked force (*electa manus*) of Franks, Lombards and *ceterorum nationes* the Arabs were again defeated. Andreas again finds a moral in this, for it is the judgement of God that those who exalt themselves shall be humbled.¹⁹¹

Andreas treats Louis's capture by Adelchis of Benevento in a curious fashion. Louis followed his victory over the Arabs by residing in the ruler's palace in Benevento. Initially relations between Adelchis and the emperor were cordial (*dilectone caritatis inter se diliebant*). But then *malos homines inter se occulte dicentes: quid grabati sumus sub potestate Francorum*?¹⁹² Adopting the same idea as the *GEN* Andreas says that the Beneventans *rederent malum pro bonum*.¹⁹³ But crucially Andreas says it was not Louis himself but his *fidelissimi* who were imprisoned and prevented from going to him.¹⁹⁴ The Franks were separated by castles and towns because they *fidentes absque ullo terrore, credentes fide Beneventanorum*. This reference to faith is not incidental for it was *Deus, qui domno imperatore ad regni gubernacula imperialis ordinaverat* and *taliter fideles suos ad eum venire fecit*. As a result *caelestis timor super Beneventanos irruit* causing them to release the prisoners.¹⁹⁵ Implicitly the successful resolution of the problem resulted from divine favour. But it's a decidedly different account from that offered by other sources:¹⁹⁶ Louis himself is not personally subjected to capture and it only takes a rather mysterious exercise¹⁹⁷ of his divinely-sanctioned power to bring the Beneventans to heel. However as in other texts the Beneventans are disparaged for their bad faith: they are *anticus hostis*, inspired by *mali homines*, they create *per fraudem uno consilio*.

¹⁹¹Andreas, p. 228, ll. 21-34, c. 15.

¹⁹²Andreas, p. 228, ll. 35-39.

¹⁹³Andreas, p. 228, ll. 39-40; cf. *GEN* p. 435, ll. 27-9 & below ch. III, p. 117.

¹⁹⁴Andreas, p. 228, ll. 40-1: *quatenus ubicumque fidelissimi imperatori invenissent, ibi custodirent et ad imperatore non dimisissent redirent*.

¹⁹⁵Andreas p. 228, l. 42-229, l. 6.

¹⁹⁶Cf. *AB*, a. 871; and below ch. III.

¹⁹⁷He simply *suos fideles ad eum venire fecit*: Andreas, p. 229, l. 4.

In terms of raw information the text has been widely considered lightweight. Andreas's account is missing many 'significant' events. He has just one brief mention of Pippin of Italy. He passes in silence over the imperial coronation of 800. Although he lists the legislation of the Lombard kings (often inaccurately, perhaps drawing information from (incomplete ?) legal manuscripts¹⁹⁸), Andreas never once refers to the substantial body of Carolingian capitularies.¹⁹⁹ Moreover Andreas's interest or information on Lothar I's sons did not extend to any mention at all of Lothar II's divorce; although he was aware that Lothar II had visited Italy he does not indicate why. Even in his account of the reign of Louis II, during which Andreas lived, his reports of the emperor's activities are almost exclusively concerned with campaigns in the south.

Against this lack of (as far as modern historians have been concerned) hard historical data Andreas has a great interest in the symbolic. This is particularly true of the later parts of the text. Both Louis the Pious's and Louis II's deaths are preceded by portents. In the case of the former this involved an eclipse followed the next night by a dawn illuminated 'almost as if it were daylight';²⁰⁰ for the latter Andreas's account is even more complex: wine goes bad in its casks, a drought attacks the vines and trees, Comacchio is burnt by the Saracens and then in August locusts sweep the eastern Po valley.²⁰¹ Louis's death thus provides the climax to a series of crises. Delogu rightly treated this passage as a demonstration of a general sense of apocalypse connected with the end of the reign.²⁰² One can probably go a little further. Andreas orders events correctly but compresses them. I would suggest therefore that the events of c.17, the spoilt wine, the drought and the

¹⁹⁸Suggested by Wickham, 'Lawyers', p. 58.

¹⁹⁹See ch. VI below. Further to n. above: Andreas's account of the Lombard legislators merely lists their production by number of pieces of legislation but does so inaccurately never recording all of their laws. He claims Ratchis produced 8 (actually 13) and Aistulf 13 capitoli (of 22). I have been unable to find such a manuscript tradition. Strangely however, excluding the legislation issued in the first year of these kings, Andreas's figures are correct i.e. Ratchis issued five laws in his first year and eight in the rest of his reign. The significance of this, if any, remains obscure.

²⁰⁰Andreas, p. 226, ll. 4-16.

²⁰¹Andreas, p. 229, ll. 7-25.

²⁰²P. Delogu, 'Strutture Politiche e Ideologia nel Regno di Lodovico II', *BISI* 80 (1968), pp. 137-89 at 185-86. Cf the comments in *Landscapes of Fear*, (Cambridge, 1994), pp. 5-6.

plague of locusts refer to the comment at the end of the chapter where Andreas notes that it is one hundred years since the Franks conquered Italy. The meaning of the locusts is implied by Andreas in c.18 where he quotes Proverbs: the locusts have no king but go forth in bands.²⁰³ It is perhaps therefore also intended as a comment on both the future of the Italian kingdom and about the Arabs who attack Comacchio. The comet which appears at the start of the passage²⁰⁴ prefigures the forthcoming Arab attack on Comacchio and Louis's death. The plague of locusts may pre-echo the journey of Louis II's body. The locusts come from Vicenza to the territory of Brescia, where the emperor died and then, following a curious route, move to the territories of Cremona and Milan. The areas devastated by the locusts is repeated in the same order in the account of those bishops involved in the transfer of Louis's body from Brescia via Cremona to Milan. However although the locusts attack Vicenza the bishop of Vicenza is not reported by Andreas to be involved in the transfer of the emperor's body and Andreas's own see, Bergamo is not reported to have suffered from locusts although its prelate, Garibald of Bergamo, was involved in the transfer of the imperial corpse, so the match up is not complete.

The re-evaluation of Andreas's historical thought attempted above requires a reconsideration of his date of writing. The traditional date of the text's composition is c. 877. The internal evidence only provides a *terminus post quem*. The strongest piece of evidence for a c. 877 date is the early incomplete manuscript which Bischoff noted²⁰⁵ but this need only prove that the text was already known in an incomplete form by the end of the ninth century. The key point is the extraordinary emphasis throughout the text on the deeds of the ruler. Almost literally every anecdote in the work is related to Andreas's view of monarchy-determined history. Considering this, his treatment of the family of Berengar I is perhaps important for dating the work.

²⁰³Prov. 30, 27; Andreas, c. 17, ll. 15: *Locustas regem non habent, sed per turmas ascendunt*.

²⁰⁴Andreas, p. 229, ll. 21-2.

²⁰⁵Bischoff, 'Italienische Handschriften', p. 178.

Obviously many other figures feature in Andreas's work but Berengar's family (in the person of Eberhard of Friuli and then his son Unroch) is introduced as early as practicable.²⁰⁶ It is explained that Slav attacks caused much distress to the Lombards (sic) and then that 'the emperor made Eberhard *princeps* over the Friulan frontiers'. It is emphasized that this office passed on down the family line.²⁰⁷ No other family or figure receives such treatment. This unique set of reports on an aristocratic family²⁰⁸ and the special treatment of Berengar may suggest that Andreas knew he later became king, hence the history must have been written after 888. Likewise the complete absence of the Widonids from the text implies a date before 890. That there is no comparable consideration of Guy or Lambert, whose reigns in the 890s could scarcely be ignored, might be explained if Andreas was writing pro-Berengar propaganda. However Andreas's only surviving report about Berengar himself is hostile: he is recorded devastating part of the territory of Bergamo in the retinue of Louis the German's son, Carloman, during the latter's bid for the imperial throne in late 875.²⁰⁹ That Andreas was concerned to record Berengar's part in this raiding does not suggest he was a supporter; Berengar is the only figure thus identified.

It is possible that Andreas's emphasis on the Unruochings resulted from his emphasis on Friuli (perhaps a borrowing from Paul the Deacon). However the title the Unruochings inherited, *princeps Foroiulianorum*, has parallels in the text. The same term is used on four other occasions. The arab leader 'Amelmasser' is described as *princeps*.²¹⁰ A certain Cincimo, the leader of troops from the city of Amantea in Calabria, came out to join a

²⁰⁶ Andreas, c. 8, p. 226.

²⁰⁷ Andreas, c. 8, p. 226: *Multa fatigatio Langobardi et oppressio a Sclavorum gens sustinuit, usque dum imperator Foroiulianorum fines Ebherardo principem constituit. eo defuncto, Unhroch, filio suo, principatum suscepit.*

²⁰⁸ Three reports concern the Unruochings: c. 8, p. 226 - Eberhard's appointment as duke of Friuli and Unroch's succession; c. 15, p. 228 - Unroch's campaigning in southern Italy; c. 19, p. 230 - Berengar's involvement in 875.

²⁰⁹ Andreas, c. 19, p. 230, ll. 3-5 ...*ceperunt homines qui se ad Carlito coniunxerunt multa malitia facere, hoc est Beringherio [sic] cum reliquis multitudo, statim venerunt in finibus Bergomensis, resedente in monasterio Fara per aedomada una, domibus devastantes, adulteria vel incendia facientes.*

²¹⁰ Andreas, p. 227, ll. 13-14.

Frankish attack on the Arabs and contributed greatly to the victory. He is described as *eorum principe Cincimo*.²¹¹ In 871 Louis II sent Unroch, Agefrid and Boso, *principes suis*, to carry out another attack.²¹² Later in the campaign when Louis arrived in Benevento *Adelchis principatum Beneventanorum regebat*.²¹³ This last is the title used by the rulers of Benevento after 774. Quite what distinguished *principes* from other nobles is not clear. It is not simply a catch-all term for *optimates*: Otto *de finibus Bergomensis*, presumably a count, was simply described as one of the *stremuis et nobilissimis viris*.²¹⁴ Clearly, although not always semantically precise, *principatus* denoted high secular status, important military duties and for Christian leaders, the control of a region.

Lastly there is the question of Andreas's 'Lombardism', for if Andreas has been poorly thought of as a chronicler his attitudes as a historian have attracted more interest. He is regarded as one of the 'Lombard' writers; along with Erchempert and Paul the Deacon one of the most important, who preserved a sense of difference from the Franks. Certainly the passage concerning the locusts has been interpreted as anti-Frankish²¹⁵ but to take this episode out of context does no justice to some of the ambiguities of the text. Andreas's view of Louis the Pious and of Louis II's southern campaigns, for instance, is positive, although his attitude towards Louis II himself has been more controversial. Löwe felt that

²¹¹ Andreas, c. 14, p. 227, ll. 38. Cincimus was in fact emir of Amantea, a key strategic point south-east of Cosenza, Böhmer *Regesten* vol. III *Die Regesten des Regnum Italiae und der Burgundischer Regna teil: die Karolinger im Regnum Italiae 840-887 (888)* ed. H. Zielinski (1991, Cologne, Vienna - henceforward BMZ) nos. 313, 315, pp. 128, 129; E. Eickhoff, *Seekrieg und Seepolitik zwischen Islam und Abendland*, (Berlin, 1966), pp. 216, 240f.

²¹² Andreas, p. 228, c. 15, ll. 28-9. Unroch is Eberhard's eldest son, Boso is the future king of Provence but I have been unable to establish Agefrid's identity.

²¹³ Andreas, p. 228, c. 16, l. 36.

²¹⁴ Andreas, c. 14, ll. 36-7, p. 227. J. Jarnut, *Bergamo 568-1098* (Wiesbaden, 1978), p. 256, no. xxviii considers Otto to be count of Bergamo itself, probably the same Otto who held property in Almenno, near Lecco, in 867. *CDL* I no. 242. This is possible but the Almenno property tended to stay in the hands of those related to the Carolingians: Hlawitschka, *Franken*, pp. 213-14 notes Louis the German confirming it to Louis II's daughter in Feb. 26, 875 (while Louis II was still alive): *Dip. Ludwig der Deutsche*, no. 157, pp. 220-1; in the early tenth century the property was associated with the county of Lecco, not Bergamo: *CDL* no. 518 (Mar 926) for Conrad. Cf. F. Menant, *Campagnes Lombardes du Moyen âge: l'Economie et la société rurales dans la région de Bergame, de Crémone et de Brescia du Xe au XIIIe siècle*, (École Française de Rome, 1993), p. 406, n. 39.

²¹⁵ Andreas, p. 229, ll. 7-17.

he had 'a warm tone' for the emperor but Mor claimed Andreas was lukewarm about Louis II because he used no adjectives about him.²¹⁶ These are highly subjective issues and depend to a large measure on one's belief in Lombard 'nationalism' as well as one's appreciation of the text, although on the whole I tend more towards Löwe's view. Andreas certainly made a distinction between Lombards and Franks but the whole army of the *regnum Italiae* are described as Franks which can hardly be accurate and certainly bespeaks some confusion (or at least a very different conception of ethnicity from that which we might expect) about identity within the text.²¹⁷ Moreover Louis was, according to some, more disposed to place Lombards in senior positions than earlier Carolingians.²¹⁸ But to what extent the distinction between Lombards and Franks was still really meaningful must be open to question. The classic example of Lombard nationalism in the north was Bernard's revolt but this has now been reinterpreted.²¹⁹ The other 'Lombard' texts are either the work of earlier writers (Paul the Deacon) or southerners (like Erchempert) and the southern tradition was very much more vigorous and self-consciously Lombard (with varying definitions of the term however)²²⁰ than anything known from the north. Whatever Andreas's 'Lombard' sentiments one fact remains clear: in his account of ninth century Italy the Carolingians play such a central role that his history deals with almost nothing other than their actions. They are central to his understanding of the recent past, even if they are Franks. Andreas's evidence suggests that the Italian subjects of the Carolingians may not have been well-informed about their rulers but they certainly weren't uninterested.²²¹

²¹⁶Ed. Löwe, *DG*, p. 404; Mor, 'Storiografia', p. 243.

²¹⁷H. Löwe, 'Von den Grenzen des Kaisergedankens in der Karolingerzeit', *DA* 14 (1958) pp. 345-74 at 355.

²¹⁸Delogu, 'Lodovico II', p. 166.

²¹⁹Noble, 'Revolt', cit.; Jarnut, 'Bernhard', *passim*.

²²⁰See below ch. III.

²²¹Contra cf. Wickham, *Early Medieval Italy*, pp. 50-1.

The *Chronicon Brixense* (CB): This text, first published by Muratori,²²² was considered lost until the computistical manuscript containing it, Padua, Biblioteca Antoniana scaff. I, 27, was independently rediscovered and republished by both Mercati²²³ and Morin.²²⁴ Its attribution has been the subject of some debate. Because the *CB* contains an account of the translation of the relics of St. Benedict to the monastery of Leno the manuscript has traditionally been attributed to that house near Brescia.²²⁵ However Pagnin, followed by Löwe,²²⁶ argued for a Verona attribution on palaeographical and liturgical grounds. Neither argument is decisive. More recently and thoroughly, Sandmann has returned to the idea of an attribution to Leno, largely on internal textual grounds.²²⁷ I agree with her analysis but think it could be even more strongly supported. The palaeographical similarities with Veronese manuscripts which Pagnin discerned only prove a Veronese influence on the copyist who need not have been the text's author since Pagnin plausibly resorts to multiple authorship to explain some of the work's eccentricities but the manuscript of the *CB* is written in a single hand. A Veronese influence is perfectly possible: Verona was a major cultural centre and bishop Noting was translated to Brescia from Verona in 844²²⁸ but the text itself does not comfort a Verona attribution. Likewise although Pagnin argues correctly²²⁹ that the liturgical calendar on fols. 103-8v includes the typically Veronese feasts of S. Zeno, SS. Firmus and Rusticus and the dedication of the

²²²Muratori, *AI* IV, 942-3, based on a transcription by Giovanni Brancaccio. For ease references are to Pertz's edition (*MGH SS* III, pp. 238-40) which, since Pertz could not find the manuscript, was based on Muratori. Note however that Pertz arbitrarily moved the paragraph at the start of Muratori's edition to the end of the *MGH* version.

²²³G. Mercati, 'Il Catalogo Leonense dei Re Longobardi e Franchi', *Römische Quartelschrift* (1895), pp. 337-49.

²²⁴D. G. Morin, 'La Translation de St. Benoit et la Chronique de Leno', *Revue Bénédictine* 19 (1902), pp. 337-506, text 339-341. B. Pagnin, 'La Provenienza del codice Antoniana 27 e del «Chronicon Regum Langobardorum» in esso contenuto', *Miscellanea in Onore di Roberto Cessi*, (Rome, 1958), vol. I pp. 29-41, at 30 notes Mercati, incorrectly gave the shelfmark as Antoniana, scaff. I, 25.

²²⁵Thus Brancaccio (and hence Muratori and Pertz), Mercati, Morin. Leno is c. 20 km south of Brescia.

²²⁶Löwe, *DG* IV, pp. 405-6 & n. 85.

²²⁷M. Sandmann, *Herrscherverzeichnisse als Geschichtsquellen. Studien zur langobardisch-italienischen Überlieferung*, (Münstersche Mittelalter-Schriften bd. 41; Munich, 1984), pp. 101-18, 348.

²²⁸J. Bonini-Valetti, 'L'epoca Franco-Carolingia', *DBrescia*, (Varese, 1992), pp. 26-7 with refs.

²²⁹Pagnin, 'Provenienza', p. 35.

cathedral of Zeno, he does not reveal that the calendar also includes a number of typically Brescian saints days, such as the feast day and *translatio* of SS. Faustinus and Giovitta, and the feasts of, respectively, St. Giulia and St. Filastus, (not to mention a series of saints days with no obvious association with either city²³⁰). A sermon survives by bishop Rambert of Brescia (824/6-44) on the occasion of the translation of the relics of St. Filastus to the winter cathedral of S. Maria.²³¹ The cult of SS. Faustinus and Giovitta appears to have had a Brescian link too, possibly related to the bishop's new foundation S. Maria *ad Silvas*, later renamed St. Faustinus.²³² Perhaps even more importantly the imperial convent of S. Salvatore, which contained the relics of S. Giulia,²³³ was Leno's sister house in Brescia. Lastly it has been suggested that the cult of S. Zeno was introduced into Brescia by bishop Anfrid.²³⁴ If so this would leave only the feast of SS. Firmus & Rusticus as a Veronese interjection into the calendar. One might also feel that the references to the translation of St. Benedict best make sense in the context of Leno's claim to have his relics. Attributing authorship of the text, if not its manuscript, to Leno seems preferable. The text's attribution is important. Leno (and S. Salvatore) had very close links to the Carolingians. S. Salvatore's abbess was often a Carolingian daughter, while Leno's abbot, Remigius, was Louis II's arch-chancellor and both institutions received

²³⁰Other saints: Gaudentius of Novara; Geminianus of Modena; Calocero of Albenga; the martyrs Valentine and Damian of Perugia; Mathew and Primus of Taranto; Alexander and Sissinius, two saints translated to Milan; Ferreolus and Ferruciunus of *Liufacensi* (unknown); S. Stephen in Ancona; Prosper of Reggio Emilia: Morin, 'Translation', pp. 349-52.

²³¹M. Betelli Bergamaschi, 'Ramperto Vescovo di Brescia (sec. IX) e la *Historia de Translatione Beati Filastrii*', *Ricerche Storiche sulla Chiesa Ambrosiana* V (1975), pp. 48-140; text, pp. 125-37.

²³²For a history of the cult (which is difficult) see A. Amore, 'Faustino e Giovitta', *Bibliotheca Sanctorum* vol. V, (Rome, 1964) cols. 483-5. The *Passio S. Faustino et Jovitae* (*AASS Jan I* 751, *Feb. II*, 805-21; also edited by F. Savio in *Analecta Bollandiana* 15 (1896) pp. 5f, 113f., 377f.) is sometimes attributed to Rambert's authorship; but Bognetti, in *SBrescia* I, p. 984 is sceptical.

²³³Betelli Bergamaschi, 'Ramperto', p. 58 with refs.

²³⁴P. Guerrini, 'Nella Luce di 4 Centenarii,' *Memorie Storiche della Diocesi di Brescia*, ser. 9a, (1938), pp. 235-44 makes a circumstantial but not decisive case for the saint's cult in the Brescia area dependent largely on the dedications of parish churches; repeated by Betelli Bergamaschi, 'Ramperto', p. 71 n. 155.

charters from the emperors.²³⁵ If the *CB* is from Leno it would affect our evaluation of the text, although perhaps in surprising ways.

The text has been widely disparaged, probably rightly: 'un disordinato e schematico quadro cronologico'.²³⁶ It is little more than a king list with a few additional comments, is barely a folio page in length and is clearly a composite work based on fragments written at different times, as I shall demonstrate below on the basis of the dating calculations. The text is neither hagiography, although it contains an account of the translation of the relics of St. Benedict, nor history although it mentions various events. It now survives as part of a computistical manuscript.²³⁷ This is the key to understanding such historical material as it contains as it is built around the king-list and the computistical exercises based on date calculations. Thus it begins if one wants to know how many years have passed *ex quo Franci, id est Karolus rex Francorum, Italiam apprehendit* multiply 15 by 7 = 105, add 3 and subtract 12, (giving 96 years) *indictione in mense iulio quo Karolus Desiderium regem Langobardorum comprehendit* or 870/1.²³⁸ Via another calculation the text states that 'to the present time' 313 years had passed since the Lombards conquered Italy, (giving the date 883). But the text concludes the Lombards had held Italy for 202 years from 570 giving 772. There is little of any representational significance in this set of calculations except a recollection of the repeated conquest of Italy. However there then follows a Lombard king-list from Cleph onwards who became king in 572, suggesting a start date in 774. The list is correct and follows the standard succession. Pagnin²³⁹ incorrectly states this list comes from the same tradition as the *origo gentis langobardorum*. There are in

²³⁵CDL ed. Schiaparelli no. 221= *Ludovici II Diplomata* ed. K. Wanner (*FSI: Antiquitates* 3 - Istituto Storico Italiano per il Medio Evo), no. 35, pp. 137-9 (861/2) refers to earlier documents, now lost. Remigius: Fleckenstein, *Hofkappelle*, p. 140. Leno: Bonini-Valetti, *DBrescia*, p. 27 with refs.

²³⁶E.g. Viscardi, *Le Origini*, p. 52.

²³⁷Intuitied without further comment by L. Gherardi, 'Il Codice Angelica 123, Monumento della Chiesa Bolognese nel sec. XI', *Quadrivium* III (1959), pp. 1-110, at n. 5, pp. 22-5, esp. p. 23: the manuscript's 'substrato storico-cronologico [è] qui usato per l'esercitazione computistico'.

²³⁸*CB*, pp. 238 to 239, l. 1.

²³⁹Pagnin, 'Provenienza', p. 41; *contra* Löwe, *DG* IV, p. 406 n. 85; Sandmann, *Herrscherverzeichnisse*, p. 164.

fact significant differences between the two lists.²⁴⁰ The *origo* ends with Perctarit (672-88) whereas the *CB* continues until 774 and then lists the Carolingians, information which must be drawn from elsewhere. It seems more likely that the *CB* drew its information from the same tradition as Paul the Deacon, or from the *Historia Langobardorum* itself.

The regnal lengths of the Carolingians in the list are revealing. The forty year reign of Charlemagne (simply designated *Karolus*) is given correctly for Italy, i.e 774-814; likewise Louis II's twenty-six years presumably representing 850-75 and counting the first year itself. However Louis the Pious's 814-40 and Lothar's 817/822-55 are given as respectively twenty and sixteen years. This may represent the vagaries of the dating clauses of documents. Lothar's regnal length is particularly difficult and there are several possibilities because of the flexibility of the number sixteen. Lothar was given Italy in 817;²⁴¹ his regnal dates appear on imperial Italian documents from 822 but from 835 onwards he dropped Louis the Pious's name, title and regnal dates from his Italian charters.²⁴² If the removal of Louis the Pious's recognition from Italian documents after 835 was held to be illegitimate then the *CB* compiler might have reacted by denying Lothar's 'reign' thereafter. Alternatively the sixteen years might cover the years of Lothar's adult rule as senior Carolingian from 840-55, counting the first year as 'year one'. However the simplest solution is to begin with Louis the Pious's twenty years, clearly starting from 814 because of Charlemagne's forty years for 774-814. Louis the Pious's twenty years would then be held to have run from 814-34 when Lothar removed his father's name from documents. Lothar's sixteen years would therefore represent 834 to 850, the date from which Louis II's twenty-six years are calculated.²⁴³

²⁴⁰E.g. *CB*, p. 239, ll. 13-15 gives Agilulf's reign as 25 years Rothari's as 17, and includes the six-month reign of Roduald (652-3). The *origo* (*MGH SS RL*, pp. 2-6, at 4-5) cc. 6-7, lists Agilulf's reign as 6 years, Rothari's as 16 and omits Romuald entirely. Sandmann, *Herrscherverzeichnisse*, pp. 160-75, deals with the Lombard king list at exhaustive length.

²⁴¹*Ordinatio Imperii*, *MGH Cap.* I, no. 136, pp. 270-3, c. 17.

²⁴²See *DLo*, nos. 1f.; H. Wolfram, 'Lateinische Herrscher- und Fürstentitel ins neunten und zehnten Jahrhundert', *Intitulatio* II, (*MIÖG Ergänzungsband* 24, 1973), pp. 19-179 at 59-60, cf. 172.

²⁴³For all this Sandmann, *Herrscherverzeichnisse*, p. 177.

Although it seems feasible that the *CB* may have extrapolated Carolingian regnal dates from documents it is hard to know which sources could have been used. Private documents did not change their use of Louis the Pious's name, title and dates in 834 so the presumption must be that imperial documents were used but the compiler of the *CB* would have needed considerable document caches to be able to calculate regnal years on their basis.

Two very short reports follow the king-list. One notes that 'in the eighteenth²⁴⁴ year of his reign' (i.e supposedly 865) Louis II occupied Benevento and captured those who *eam possidebant* interestingly listed as Seldanum prince of the Saracens, 'a Christian prince Daiferius by name' and Adelchis of Benevento. There is no reference to him fighting the Arabs. Louis's own capture 'by the Beneventans' in 871 immediately follows this report; they compelled him, his wife and daughters to swear an oath, although the subject of the oath (that Louis would never return to Benevento) is not mentioned.²⁴⁵ It would be most interesting if the *CB*'s report is correct that Louis's daughters were also required to swear an oath. The detail is also recorded in the *AB*²⁴⁶ and it may be worth recalling Louis's daughter Gisela had been granted the convent of S. Salvatore in Brescia.²⁴⁷

There follow the regnal lengths of Charles the Bald, Karlomann and Charles the Fat. Its only comment is that Charles the Bald *fuit autem valde pius, suo autem magnam pacem, quia unusquisque gaudebat de bonis suis*. The text then returns to Lombard history, commenting that after Aistulf's death *gubernavitque palacium Ticinensis Ratchis, gloriosus germanus eius, dudum rex tunc autem Christi famulus, a decembrio usque Martium*.²⁴⁸ The closest approach to this formula is in the only surviving charter of

²⁴⁴Pertz, *CB*, p. 239 n. (b.) incorrectly notes that the ms. reads 17, emended in the *MGH* to 18. The reproduction of ms. fol. 123v, Sandmann, *Herrscherverzeichnisse*, Abb. 1a., clearly shows this to be wrong: the ms. reads XVIII.

²⁴⁵*CB*, p. 239, ll. 21-6. Sandmann, *Herrscherverzeichnisse*, p. 185 & n. 437, considers this detail noteworthy. I do not share her surprise at the omission of the names of Louis's female kin. The text is very terse.

²⁴⁶*AB* a. 871, pp. 117-18..

²⁴⁷*DLII*, no. 34, pp. 135-6 (13 Jan. 861); C. Violante, *SBrescia* I, p. 1013.

²⁴⁸*CB*, p. 239, ll. 35-7.

Ratchis's renewed government (December 756 to March 757) issued in February 757 for the bishop of Pisa.²⁴⁹ The *CB*'s evidence perhaps suggests another charter was preserved in Brescia, perhaps in S. Giulia itself founded in early 757. It reinforces the impression derived from considering the regnal lengths of the Carolingians that the *CB* was written on the basis of documents preserved in, for want of a better term, the monastery's cartulary.

The *CB* then records some information about the origins of the monastery itself: its foundation by Desiderius, the exile of Anselm of Nonantola (possibly suggesting the author knew the *Vita Anselmi*),²⁵⁰ the translation of the relics of Benedict and the appointment of Ermoald of Benevento as abbot. Desiderius is warmly remembered in his own foundation. The *CB* then concludes this section with the arrival of Charlemagne who *datum est ab ipso Karolo nostro monasterio*²⁵¹ [sic; presumably a word is missing]-perhaps a reference to the lost charter of Charlemagne referred to above. This segment of the *CB* seems to be essentially a short history of the monastery. The early history of ecclesiastical institutions in Italy was not infrequently recorded in charters.²⁵² The regnal years evidence, the phrase taken from a charter of Ratchis and the Italian practice of recording information about the history of the monastery in charters all reinforce the impression that the *CB* drew much of its data from charters.

Superficially this is all the more remarkable when we consider Leno's close relationship with the Carolingians. However we must counterbalance this relationship with the nature of the text. It is essentially an expanded king-list designed for inclusion in a computistical manuscript. The information it records is secondary to its role as a chronology. Its

²⁴⁹*CDL*, vol. I ed. Schiaparelli, no. 124, pp. 367-8: *In N(o)m(ine) d(omi)ni D(e)i n(ostr)i Iesu Christi guvernan(e) d(omi)n(us) Ratchis famula Christi Iesu principem gentis Languardorum anno primo...*; Cf. M. P. Andreolli, 'Una Pagina di Storia Ancora: Re Ratchis', *Nuova Rivista Storica* L (1966), pp. 281-327 at 322-3. Further, Sandmann, *Herrscherverzeichnisse*, pp. 95f.

²⁵⁰However the earliest manuscript of this text is from eleventh-century Nonantola; cf. *MGH SS RL*, pp. 566-70, esp. intro. by Bethmann. How the *CB* acquired this information is not clear; Pagnin, 'Provenienza', pp. 39-40, suggests word of mouth. Sandmann, *Herrscherverzeichnisse*, pp. 117f, & cf. 279f.) implies the *CB* may have had a more direct link with Nonantola.

²⁵¹*CB* p. 230, l. 54.

²⁵²E.g. *DLII* no. 13, pp. 88-90 (a. 853) for S. Zeno, Verona recording Pippin's role in the restoration of the cathedral.

approach to the representation of the Carolingians is decidedly dry. But one can note that a distinction was drawn between the Carolingians and the Lombard kings who preceded them and that the *CB* demonstrates that Louis II's southern campaigns against the Arabs were recorded even in a historical work as terse as this. The vagaries of the regnal dates of the Carolingians in the *CB* also show that high political events could have echoes in the most unexpected places, such as computistical manuscripts.

Libellus de imperatoria potestate in urbe Roma: This text²⁵³ is one of the hardest to provenance or date from early medieval Italy. Its author is unknown (although in the nineteenth century it was attributed to Benedict of Monte Soracte). No manuscript copy survives; it is known only from an early modern edition. It has been attributed to variously Spoleto, Ravenna,²⁵⁴ Monte Soracte and Rome; there is some evidence for each of these attributions but all are circumstantial and fairly convincing counter-arguments exist against each of these attributions too.²⁵⁵ Since the 1920s however a consensus of opinion has attributed the text to the last quarter of the ninth century or at any rate 'no later than the first decade of the tenth'.²⁵⁶ This dating therefore places the *libellus* within the remit of this chapter. Obviously the ambiguity concerning the origin and authorship of the text makes it difficult to assign it to either within or outside the *regnum italiae*. It has been included in this chapter since the balance of probability suggests an origin in a zone heavily-influenced by the Carolingians.

The grounds for considering the *libellus* a late ninth or early-tenth century text seem reasonable. There is much detailed information concerning Louis II which appears to be

²⁵³MGH SS III, ed. Pertz, pp. 719-22. New edition by G. Zucchetti, *Il chronicon di Benedetto, Monaco di S. Andrea del Soratte e il libellus de imperatoria potestate in urbe Roma*, (FSI 55; Rome, 1920), pp. 191-210.

²⁵⁴Gaudenzi, 'Il Monastero di Nonantola, il Ducato di Persiceta e la Chiesa di Bologna', *BISI* 36 (1916), pp. 7-312; 37 (1916), pp. 313-570 at 524f.

²⁵⁵Aibly summarized by Zucchetti, *Chronicon*, pp. LXX-LXXXII. For later work: contra Spoleto: T. Leporace, 'L'Imperatrice Ageltrude', *Samnium* 9 (1936), fasc. 1-2, pp. 1-45, 9. 3-4, pp. 142-76, at 149-54.

²⁵⁶P. E. Schramm, *Kaiser, Rom und Renovatio. Geschichte des Römischen Erneuerungsgedankens vom Ende des karolingischen Reiches bis zum Investiturstreit*, (Berlin, 1929), vol. I, pp. 64-6; followed by Bruhl, 'Kaiserpfalz', pp. 3-4; and Löwe *DG* IV, p. 425 (whence the later date).

nearly-contemporary. Equally there are some bizarre factual errors which have been used to support a later date. Even more importantly the text ends with the flight of a king Charles and a much-discussed statement that after him *ab illo die honorificas consuetudines regiae dignitatis nemo imperatorum, nemo regum acquisivit*. How long a period the phrase *ab illo die* is supposed to denote, and whether the author meant it to be understood rhetorically (i.e no-one really worthy had appeared) or as reportage is unclear. In many regards the dating of the *libellus* depends on this phrase.

The text's concerns are highly legalistic. The thread running through the work is the establishment and development of the legal and political structures which defined Rome's relationship with the emperor. Much of the account thus created is factually quite wrong but is internally coherent. The work opens with a short passage about the glory days of empire. This is interpreted in administrative terms: it was when many *gentes* submitted under the domination of Rome, consuls were established, offices distributed to senators and magistrates. After Christ's Coming however, as the *libellus* for once correctly states, under Constantine the empire was transferred to Byzantium [sic]. However the text's account reorders events to provide a decidedly different reading of the history of the Empire's relationship with Christianity. *Diversis apostolis* went to Constantinople but the emperors martyred them; and in Rome many others were martyred because the people were seduced by idols. After this Peter proselytized Rome but he (and Paul, introduced here) were also martyred. Rome was thus divided and *multarum gentium populi contra urbem fuerant rebelles*²⁵⁷ - presumably the kind of troubles that the legal and political structures described in the rest of the text were supposed to resolve. The Lombards then arrived, invited by pope Silverius. The Greek authorities, personified in the text by Narses and his wife, demanded why the pope had sent for the Lombards and then tonsured him and confined him to the monastery of S. Saba. As a result the Lombards arrived and, following their conversion, caused the 'Greeks' to flee *et cessavit imperium ab urbe Roma*

²⁵⁷*Libellus*, p. 719, ll. 32-52=ed Zucchetti, p. 191, ll. 4-5.

usque ad Francos. This opening section of the text sets out the concerns of the *libellus*. It associates the decline of Rome not with the arrival of Christianity but rather, with the persecution of the Church, initially the Apostles and martyrs, and later the Papacy. The decisive moment marking destruction of the empire is when the authorities fall out with the Papacy. In the rest of the *libellus* the good relationship between the Carolingians and the Papacy established the environment in which Rome could again flourish thanks to the safeguards of the legal and administrative systems.

The text's account of the Carolingians is, for once, therefore central to its whole purpose. Taken on its own terms it presents a notably different version of Papal-Carolingian relations than normal. Pope Zacharias is represented inviting to Italy 'that Charles who had the daughter of king Desiderius of Italy as a wife'. Zacharias thus *seminans inter regis discordias, laudans et proferens illi [Carolus] imperialia sceptrā; accepitque securitatem*. Evidently events concerning Zacharias and Pippin III have been confused with Charlemagne. However the *libellus's* interpretation of the trade-off between Charlemagne and the Papacy, security in return for the imperial crown, is one often accepted by modern historians. According to the *libellus* Charlemagne then conquered the Lombard kingdom and established the payment of annual tribute to Pavia from Rome - presumably designed as a revival (or echo) of that antique annual tribute referred to earlier in the text paid for the restoration of churches.²⁵⁸ This led to the creation of a *pactum cum Romanis eorumque pontifice, et de ordinatione pontificis, ut interesset quie legatus, et ut contentiosas lites ipse deliberaret*. The settlement of disputes was to be carried out at *placiti* at which the emperor or his representative *compellantes habitatores loco illorum venire*,²⁵⁹ suggesting that the imperial settlement of such disputes was not always wanted by those involved.

²⁵⁸*Libellus*, p. 720, ll. 33-6=ed. Zuchetti, p. 195, ll. 1-6. Cf. p. 720, ll. 9-10=ed. Zuchetti, p. 192, ll. 19-21.

²⁵⁹*Libellus*, p. 720, ll. 33-8=ed. Zuchetti, p. 196, ll. 2f.

Leo III's role is remarkably different. He is represented as the defender of imperial prerogatives against the impudence of the Romans who sought to strip from the Frankish ruler the donatives given by major monasteries near the city (such as Monte Soracte). When Leo resisted the rebels *comprehenderunt eum volueruntque eius eruere oculos*,²⁶⁰ However they only blinded him in one eye and the pope made his way to Charlemagne who came *pro vindicta apostolici*²⁶¹ and then in a further misunderstanding by the *libellus's* author, executed three hundred Roman *maiores*. This is presumably a misrepresented account of Leo III's execution of three hundred enemies in 814.²⁶² (Interestingly, the *libellus* must have drawn this information from elsewhere for this event is not included in the *LP*.) In contrast to the failings of the Greeks earlier in the text, here it is the populace of Rome itself which acts wrongly by rising up against the pope. Wrongdoing is consistently defined as resisting the Papacy. However it is the emperor who restores order and carries out punishment.

Zucchetti considered the material concerning Charlemagne. The *libellus* states, incorrectly, that pope Zacharias invited Charlemagne to Italy, attributes to Charlemagne the construction of a palace, establishment of *missi* with rights of intervention around papal ordinations, the donation of territories and the formalizing of a pact with the Papacy. The text attributes to Charlemagne's activity conditions in Rome essentially as established by the *Constitutio Romana* of 824.²⁶³ The details of the arrangements, including the swearing of oaths and the permanent establishment of *missi* in Rome are accurate but the complete absence from the text of Lothar I suggests, as Zucchetti argues, that the text of the 824 agreement was not being used by the author. Perhaps these details were the result of the observation of current practice and its extrapolation back to a kind of 'origin-myth': everything supposedly started with Charlemagne. The author of the *Liber Pontificalis* was

²⁶⁰*Libellus*, p. 720 ll. 45-6=ed. Zuchetti, p. 196, ll. 14-15.

²⁶¹*Libellus*, p. 720, l. 49=ed. Zuchetti, p. 197, ll. 4-5.

²⁶²Astronomer, *Vita Hludowici Imperatoris*, c. 25, *MGH SS II*, p. 607; Llewellyn, *Rome*, pp. 251-2.

²⁶³*MGH Cap. I*, no. 161, pp. 323-4.

also aware of the agreements between the Papacy and the Carolingians, particularly when political friction resulted.²⁶⁴ Such issues must have been discussed (perhaps even publicly-disseminated ?) during these crises. This representation of Charlemagne as the originator of all the relationships between the Popes and the Carolingians shows that the *libellus* was poorly-informed about Louis the Pious's and Lothar's reign (Lothar is only referred to as Louis II's father).²⁶⁵ This is particularly interesting given the *libellus*'s legalistic slant. Indeed sometimes it has been interpreted as a polemical document opposing the fulfillment by the secular rulers of the obligations contained in these agreements.

The next part of the work²⁶⁶ describes the success of the arrangements between Rome (it is striking that the populace of Rome are distinguished from the Pope at several points),²⁶⁷ the Papacy and the Carolingians about the resolution of *litigiosas contentiones*. This again concerns the payments made by monasteries and the settlement of difficult disputes. The background to this was increasing imperial control: *omnes maiores Romae essent imperiales homines, tam epsicopi quam laici, et omne vulgus pariter cum his faceret fidelitatem imperatori*.²⁶⁸ This is followed by a description of the setting up of an imperial *missus* in Rome, following in fact the terms of the *Constitutio Romana* of 824. Zucchetti discusses whether this is a confused reference to the 802 capitulary's requirement that all men in the empire swear fidelity to the emperor;²⁶⁹ however the oath was only definitely extended to the Roman populace in 824.²⁷⁰ Given its association in the *libellus* with the imprecise account of the establishment of imperial *missi* in Rome I am inclined to associate this oath with the 824 arrangement.

²⁶⁴Llewellyn, *Rome*, pp. 273f.

²⁶⁵*Libellus*, p. 721, ll. 11-12=ed. Zuchetti, p. 200, ll. 1-2.

²⁶⁶*Libellus*, pp. 720, ll. 51f; 721, ll. 1-10=ed. Zuchetti, pp. 197 ll. 7f. to 199 l. 25.

²⁶⁷E. g. in the section on Leo III: *Libellus*, pp. 720, ll. 44-50 (=ed. Zuchetti, p. 196, ll. 12f, to 107, l. 6); or p. 721, l. 11 (=ed. Zuchetti, p. 200, ll. 1f) where the *Romani* are said to be used to particular customs.

²⁶⁸*Libellus*, p. 720, ll. 51-2=ed. Zuchetti, p. 197, ll. 7-9.

²⁶⁹*MGH Cap.* I, no. 33, c. 2.

²⁷⁰Zucchetti, pp. 197-8, n. 2; cf. now Noble, *Republic*, pp. 308-22.

So effective was the operation of the missus system in Rome that *multotiens vero non ante apostolicum, sed in iudicali loco ad Lateranis...ibi iudicariam legem finiebant*. The harmonious co-operation of the papal and imperial parts of the system was not affected however. *Compositiones quoque quae solebant a malefactoribus, aequaliter dividebantur misso imperatoris et apostolici. si autem talis culpa erat, ut res scelerata fisco publico subderetur, non ad ecclesiasticam transibat subiectionem, nisi per donativum imperiale preceptum*. There were also safeguards for the judges. The emperor could come to Rome to investigate *aliquis...episcopus aut iudex Romanum*. If the emperor was unavailable the duke of Spoleto could fulfill the task and *comprehendebatur offensor et ducebatur in exilium*. The key point reiterated at every turn was that this system worked.

The other Carolingian to feature prominently in the *libellus* is Louis II. The very first phrase to refer to him and the system just outlined signals the theme of the *libellus's* account of Louis: *Hac consuetudine usi sunt Romani usque ad Ludowicum magnum imperatorem*. In the *libellus* Louis II's reign is characterized by a crisis in the system, notionally established by Charlemagne, which had dictated the organization of political and legal matters between Rome and the Carolingians *until* Louis's time. The *libellus's* version of this crisis splits Louis's reign into two parts. The purpose of the first section is undoubtedly to show Louis in the early years of his reign acting as an emperor should, protecting the Papacy by waging war against the Arabs and behaving towards Rome in the approved manner. The latter section of the text²⁷¹ recounts the crisis in the system, caused by the disagreement between pope Nicholas I and Louis about archbishop John of Ravenna. The difficulty as the *libellus* presents it hinges on the relationship between emperor and pope.

In the first part the text begins by calling him *Ludowicus magnus imperator*.²⁷² Modern scholars and even some contemporaries like Hincmar,²⁷³ have criticized Louis for not

²⁷¹*Libellus*, p. 721, ll. 21f.=ed. Zuchetti, p. 200, ll. 15f.

²⁷²*Libellus* p. 721, l. 12=ed. Zuchetti, p. 200, ll. 1-2.

²⁷³Zimmermann, '*Imperatores Italiae*', *passim*.

being a 'real' emperor because he only ruled Italy but the *libellus* puts a very positive gloss on this for Louis *Italiam habitare elegit* which had the benefit that he *vicinior factus est Romae*. Indeed it was suggested to Louis that he should *repetere antiquam imperatorum dominationem*, a suggestion he rejected from *reverentiam beatorum apostolorum*. Ullmann seems to slightly misunderstand the passage: in the text Louis rejected not just 'imperial residence at Rome' but imperial *dominatio* in Rome. However Ullmann is correct to think Louis's action in the text was influenced by historical and legal precedent.²⁷⁴ This is of a piece with the rest of the *libellus*'s approach. By rejecting the suggestion that he should impose *antiqua dominatio* Louis was limiting himself to the agreed relationship between the Papacy and the Carolingians. Toubert has rightly stressed that in the *libellus* the ideal emperor was near Rome (presumably to protect it) but not resident in the city (which raised the risk of his oppressing it).²⁷⁵ This is the best interpretation of the lines concerning residence and *dominatio*. Nevertheless although not one in the ancient mould, Louis *was* an emperor and probably as an indication of this the *libellus* opens with a compressed account of Louis's ('imperial' ?) campaigns against the Arabs, noting that he crossed Beneventan territory, and captured *totius Calabriae duobus modis*, (i.e. Apulia and Calabria) including Bari.

There then follows the affair of archbishop John of Ravenna.²⁷⁶ John *serviens imperatori familiarior erat*. Nicholas was moved to anger against him; the *libellus* reveals an anti-papal (or at least anti-Nicholas) slant at this point for the pope was *invidia ductus*.²⁷⁷ Ordered to submit to Nicholas as his suffragan (which Ravenna's archbishops traditionally resisted) and threatened with an ecclesiastical *iudicio*, John fled to

²⁷⁴W. Ullmann, *Growth of Papal Government in the Middle Ages*, (London, 2nd edn. 1962), p. 160 & n. 5.

²⁷⁵Toubert, *Structures*, p. 1005.

²⁷⁶For accounts of this see R. J. Belletzkic, 'Pope Nicholas I and John of Ravenna: the Struggle for Ecclesiastical Rights in the Ninth Century', *Church History* 49.3 (1980), pp. 262-72, which however does not use the *libellus* as a source; most recent account Savigini, 'Papi', *SRavenna* II, pp. 344-8.

²⁷⁷*Libellus*, p. 721, ll. 25-7=ed. Zuchetti, p. 201, ll. 2-5: *Invidia ductus Romanus pontifex nomine Nicolaus, exarsit in iram contra illum [Johannem], vocans eum subdole Romam...*Zuchetti, p. XCII notes the importance of John's *familiaritas* with the emperor. Cf. below ch. III, on Athanasius of Naples.

Angilberga. Her *missi* were unable to solve the argument however. Indeed *quia inaudito principe apostolicus excommunicationes in eum [Johannem] protulit* as a result of which *gravis inimicitia inter eos facta est*. This personal *inimicitia* then spilled over into the institutional world for, the *libellus* concludes, *erectus est denique regius honor contra apostolicam dignitatem, obiciens ei antiqua patrum statuta*. The system passed into crisis when the two forms of authority underlying it, the *honor regis* and the *dignitatis apostolico*, conflicted. Instead of the successful co-operation of imperial and papal *missi*, disaster ensued.

According to the *libellus* Louis confiscated properties in the Pentapolis and Campania,²⁷⁸ and then brought the archbishop to Rome; *unde evenit maior discordia inter papam et imperatorem*. Presumably as a way of exerting moral pressure on Louis the pope had monks and nuns from the monasteries of Rome process round the city walls singing masses *contra principes male agentes*. The *libellus* states this was *contra dignitatem regiam*.²⁷⁹ Nicholas was then approached by the *primarii regis* who asked him *familiariter* (note, exactly the quality John was said to have possessed with the emperor) to prohibit this demonstration. He refused and as a result a group of Louis's *milites* attacked some monks near S. Paolo f.l.m and after running them off, flung crosses and icons after them.²⁸⁰ (This event was very famous in the ninth century: Erchempert recounts it too with a moral slant.²⁸¹) Louis was angered by this and Nicholas obtained an agreement with the emperor. *Iam itaque inter se familiares [again !] effecti sunt*. As a

²⁷⁸Toubert, *Structures*, pp. 1097-8 n. 3 is sceptical of this report because no other document refers to it; yet it does not seem *prima facie* implausible. The Papal-imperial disagreement was shortlived and might have slipped through the documentation unrecorded. Whatever the reality of the situation the episode's function within the *libellus* is clear: see below.

²⁷⁹*Libellus*, p. 721, ll. 46-9=ed. Zuchetti, p. 204, ll. 1-5.

²⁸⁰*Libellus*, p. 721, ll. 49-57=ed. Zuchetti, p. 204, ll. 6-15. Note l. 55 (=ed. Zuchetti l. 14) characterizes the carrying of icons as *sicut mos...Graecorum* as if this was noteworthy for the author - perhaps circumstantial proof that the *libellus* was written by someone unaccustomed to such displays.

²⁸¹Below ch. III.

result for the rest of his life Louis's *dignitas regia semper fuit Romae suisque confiniis...sicut supra praelibatum est*.²⁸²

The *libellus* emphasized the communal benefits of the politico-legal system which before had operated so smoothly. When the system broke down the consequences of failing to limit the disagreement between the emperor and the pope were widespread. Those who had held *beneficii* from the Pope in the Exarchate and Campania, the *primerii regis* and the contemplatives all became involved. The *libellus* treats the clash of personalities which produced this conflict even-handedly. Nicholas's *invidia* towards John of Ravenna had provoked Louis, but he brought John to Rome after he had been excommunicated. The confiscations and violence of the emperor's men against the Roman ecclesiastics expressed the system's breakdown. Both parties were to blame. The system the *libellus* extols was designed to regulate relations between two institutions, the Papacy and the Emperorship. But trouble ensued if pope and emperor allowed their personal disagreements to intrude into their institutional roles. If Louis and Nicholas had stuck to the system there would have been no problem.

The *libellus* thus reveals itself to be a conservative document, in favour of maintaining the arrangements supposedly created by Charlemagne. It consistently holds to a legalistic line: those who ignore the rules designed to govern the relationship between the Carolingians, the Papacy, and the Romans (and that Rome does not equal the Papacy is the key reason for *having* these arrangements) cause discord. Sticking to the rules, rather than any particular political angle, seems to be the text's central theme. Good emperors were on hand to enforce the regulations and observed them themselves. This is a very 'lawyerly' view, indeed, a 'constitutional' one, - a word about whose use I have great misgivings but which certainly seems appropriate in this context.

²⁸²*Libellus*, p. 721, ll. 56-60=ed. Zuchetti, p. 204, ll. 15f., to 205, l.3.

III

Narrative Sources II - the South

Introduction: The texts considered in this chapter all come from southern Italy. They therefore reveal the impact of the Carolingians in Italy outside the territory directly controlled by them. I shall save further comment until the end of the chapter.

Chronica Sancti Benedicti Casinensis (CSBC): Although this source¹ survives in an early tenth century manuscript (Cassino 175, formerly 353), it is now believed to be composed of three anonymous texts, all written at Montecassino after 867 (the date of the last events recounted) and probably before 871 because Louis II's imprisonment is not mentioned. This source is particularly important because it is not affected by foreknowledge of Louis's failure and was indeed written when he was at the zenith of his influence in the south. These three fragments are entitled the *annorum supputatio de monasterio sanctissimi Benedicti*, (concerning the history of southern Italy and Montecassino's place in it until 867), the *cronica* [sic] *de monasterio sanctissimi Benedicti* (essentially just a paraphrase of Paul the Deacon's information about the monastery) and the *exordium de monasterio almi Benedicti patris* (recounting traditions about the refoundation of Montecassino by Petronax of Brescia).² Only the *supputatio*³ concerns the Carolingians directly.

The only Carolingian considered is in fact Louis II. The *CSBC* account falls into two major episodes, the first dealing with the campaign of 866-7 and the second dealing with Louis's interventions in the south c. 850-2. The *supputatio* begins with a short account of

¹*MGH SS RL*, ed. Waitz, pp. 468-82.

²An excellent discussion of the text is A. Pratesi, 'La «Chronica Sancti Benedicti Casinensis»', *Montecassino dalla Prima alla Seconda Distruzione. Momenti e Aspetti della Storia Cassinese (secc. VI-IX)*. Miscellanea Cassinese 55, (Cassino, 1987), pp. 331-45; see on the manuscript 341, on the three texts 332-7. There is longstanding agreement on the account of the *CSBC* which Pratesi summarizes: cf. ed. Löwe, *DG IV* p. 436. Cf. the negative comments of Balzani, *Cronache*, pp. 110-11 which add nothing.

³The *supputatio* is published as the first twenty chapters of Waitz's edition, pp. 468-78.

PAGE NUMBERING AS IN THE ORIGINAL THESIS

south Italian history from the foundation of the monastery (incorrectly calculated as 529)⁴ to 839 when the principality of Benevento was divided, followed by Arab attacks which caused the endangered Lombards *Franciam legatos dirigunt atque gloriosi imperatoris Hludowici implorant augusti clementiam, ut patria sua cum gentes veniens, eos omnino a Saracenis quantocius eriperet*.⁵ Strikingly the *CSBC* regards Louis II's north Italian kingdom as 'Francia'. It seems implausible that the *CSBC*'s author simply misunderstood Louis's origins since the work was written before 870 at Montecassino; considering that the *GEN* likewise refers to Neapolitan envoys going to visit Lothar I 'in Francia' in the late 830s when Lothar was almost certainly in Italy and that Erchempert even calls the Spoletons 'Franks' the *CSBC* probably reproduces a southern view that northerners were members of the Carolingian empire rather than ethnic Lombards on the far side of a political frontier.⁶ In response to this request Louis made military preparations which the text records by simply copying out the 866 military capitulary - this capitulary's only copy.⁷ Having enacted this law (*hac lege sancita*) Louis went to Benevento 'with his equally glorious wife the *augusta* Angilberga'. On the way the imperial couple were received at Montecassino by abbot Bassacius *cum sacerdotali officio, lampadibus ac tymiamatibus necnon et fratrum laudibus, honorifice susceptus est*. They went up the hill where Benedict's relics were to be found. Next the *supputatio* describes as little more than a list Louis's successes: Capua was captured, Salerno entered, Amalfi, Puteolo and Sessolo approached via Naples.⁸ In Benevento Louis celebrated the seventeenth year of his reign which was followed by another victory over the Saracens. Only Bari and Taranto remained in Arab hands by August 867. Matera was captured and razed while *munitissima*. Lastly Louis returned again to Benevento where he was met by the new

⁴Pratesi, 'Chronica', p. 333.

⁵*CSBC*, pp. 469, ll. 21-24.

⁶Cf below p. 100.

⁷*MGH SS RL* pp. 469-71 = *MGH Cap. II*, no. 218, pp. 94-6. Cf below ch. VI, pp. 214f.

⁸Cf. below p. 117.

abbot of Montecassino, Bertharius, who, presumably in Louis's presence, completed a chapel in S. Sofia dedicated to St. Benedict which had been begun by Bassacius.

Pratesi has argued that the swift succession of events, almost like a triumphal procession, in some later passages betrays a rhetorical education, although '*sicuramente non eccelsa*'.⁹ In fact there is certainly a literary theme in this section too (although if the *supputatio* is accurate it is a theme encoded in the activities of the emperor himself). Louis is represented undertaking the correct legal and spiritual preparations for the campaign ahead. Its exceptionally swift triumph can presumably be understood as a result of these appropriate preliminaries. The conclusion is capped by the dedication of the chapel of St. Benedict in the princely chapel of the ruler's palace in Benevento itself. Unquestionably the *supputatio*'s author regarded Louis's intervention very positively.

The next section of the text is an extended 'flashback' to 839 which, as its opening sentence indicates,¹⁰ provides an explanation of the origins of the crisis leading to the request for imperial help. Two points are striking about this account of the 866-7 campaigns. Firstly the heavy emphasis on the appropriate description of the emperor. He and his wife are both *gloriosus*; she is correctly styled *augusta* (as on the coinage)¹¹ and upon his return to Benevento in December 866 it is recorded that it was *anno quidem septimo decimo augustalis imperii sui*. Clearly 866-7 was understood by the author as a great victory. Secondly the close relationship in the writer's eyes between the emperor and his wife and the monastery. Angilberga, we know from other sources was close to the abbot as a patron (verses were written for her).¹² I shall return to this below.

The other major episode concerning Louis II occurs later in the text as part of the 'flashback' although it refers to earlier events. Abbot Bassacius was prevailed upon by the *primates patriae* to approach the 'glorious emperor Louis', who came to Bari and did 'as

⁹Pratesi, 'Chronica', p. 336.

¹⁰CSBC, p. 471, ll.24-5: *Si forte nosse cupis quis lector futuris eris, quam ob causam Beneventanorum regionem Saraceni dominassent, occasio videlicet exstitit talis*. Pratesi, 'Chronicon', p. 335.

¹¹Below ch. V, pp. 183-92.

¹²Below ch. IV, p. 136.

much as was possible' (*in quantum possibilitas*) to deal with the Saracens. He then returned to Benevento and on the eve of Pentecost captured the Arab leader 'Massari' before returning home.¹³ The acknowledgement that perhaps Louis could do only what was 'possible' shows that the author was aware of the scale of the problem, which explains the positive image of Louis in the *CSBC*.

Lastly and later still, in pursuit of the rebel counts Lambert, son of Wido of Spoleto, and Hildepert of Camerino, he came as far as Marsi. The rebels fled to Adelchis of Benevento and stayed in his town for some time. Louis pursued them again to Isernia, and after much fighting with the Arabs (which leads one to suspect that Louis was campaigning in the south anyway rather than pursuing the two counts) he besieged S. Agata. Bassacius, a relative of the town's gastald, persuaded Louis to raise the siege and subsequently Adelchis prostrated himself before the emperor and obtained pardon for himself and the counts.¹⁴

Both these passages show Louis as a powerful ruler, well able to dominate Arabs and Christians alike. As in the opening section of the *supputatio* he is represented storming town after town and with close links to the abbots of Montecassino. Bassacius invited him to the south in the first place; Bertharius concluded the affair of the two counts by a personal intervention with the emperor. But both sections conclude with Louis going home - indeed he lives 'in Frankia'.¹⁵ He is not a local figure but an outsider intervening. In this regard the role played by the abbots is crucial: they are the only figures who mediate between the southerners and the emperor. Adelchis's prostration is not given any special emphasis but it must have been far more important than is suggested. It was perhaps intended to echo Sikonulf of Salerno's act of submission in Rome in 844, although that event was presumably intended to legitimize Sikonulf's claims to Benevento; Adelchis's must have been designed to restore relations with Louis. In 871 of course this

¹³*CSBC*, p. 474, ll. 28-33.

¹⁴*CSBC*, p. 475, ll. 6-20. Cf. on the rebels: Ruggiero, 'Ducato', pp. 102-3; BMZ nos. 184-8, pp. 77-8.

¹⁵Löwe, 'Grenzen', p. 357.

rapprochement was to fatally undermine Louis's position in the south. Perhaps the damage done to Adelchis's prestige by this act of submission necessitated his rebellion.

Lastly, the cleric Magenolf married Angilberga's niece and later went to visit Louis to obtain 'a place to live'.¹⁶ This curious notice has been interpreted as a move by Louis to secure Pontecorvo in the Liri valley near Montecassino and has been dated c. 860.¹⁷ The *CSBC* is remarkably laconic about this event. Neither Angilberga's niece nor Magenolf himself are more clearly identified. The episode does show at least that Carolingian relatives, by marriage anyway, could be available as marriage partners for southerners.

Two other notices refer to the Franks rather than the Carolingians. Both occur in an extended account concerning the aftermath of the sack of St. Peter's by the Arabs in 846. The *Francorum exercitus* was defeated attempting to stop the Arabs¹⁸. Later on their homeward voyage the Saracen raiders described this event to a monk and a cleric whom they encountered in a boat on the sea. Gleefully they announced to the improbable ecclesiastical mariners that they had just sacked St. Peter's, 'overcome the Franks' and burned the cell of St. Benedict. The monk and the priest cryptically refused to identify themselves but the storm which immediately destroyed the entire Arab fleet presumably indicates that it was Peter and Benedict themselves.¹⁹

Despite the interpretation of the *CSBC* as a Lombard text²⁰ there is little in the work which is directly hostile to the Franks or the Carolingians. Indeed the *supputatio* is notably positive. Louis is a hero, an effective, no-nonsense military commander. His ethnic origin seems to be irrelevant - unlike in Erchempert, for example. Only later does the *CSBC* refer to Lombard history (in a part of the *CSBC* written separately from the *supputatio*) and then its information is almost all drawn from Paul the Deacon - one of the only

¹⁶*CSBC*, pp. 475, ll. 20-1, 43-5, 476, ll. 1-2.

¹⁷BMZ no. 194, p. 82.

¹⁸Possibly a reference to *GEN*, c. 60, p. 433; thus Waitz, p. 472, n. 5.

¹⁹*CSBC*, pp. 472-3, esp. ll. 9-10, & 43.

²⁰Capo, 'Polemica', pp. 13, 16.

indisputably 'Lombard' sources.²¹ the only clear reference to Lombards comes at the very start of the text where they are recorded asking Louis for help.

Erchempert of Montecassino: Erchempert of Montecassino is believed to have written his *Hystoriola*²² c. 890 because the last events he recounts concern 889 and his work is prefaced by a dedicatory poem²³ to Aio prince of Benevento (d. 891). Erchempert's work survives, with the *Chronicon Salernitanum*, (the text with which it is often compared) in a single early fourteenth century manuscript, Vat. Lat. 5001 believed to have been copied at Montecassino from a tenth-century manuscript in a Beneventan hand²⁴. Erchempert's history is concerned with events in southern Italy after the Frankish conquest of the Lombards in 774, especially the period after c. 850²⁵, which comprises some two-thirds of the text as a whole. Indeed of the 82 chapters of the work, the last forty-two cover only the decade from 879 onwards²⁶. Although his chronicle is of great importance for the history of ninth century southern Italy there has been surprisingly little historiography about his work (as opposed to historiography using the information he contains²⁷). More effort has been devoted to analyzing Erchempert's monastic and (supposedly) noble status²⁸ than to the work itself. Surprisingly, like Andreas of Bergamo,

²¹Pratesi, 'Chronica', pp. 332-8.

²²Erchempert, *Historia Langobardorum Beneventanorum*, ed. G. Waitz, *MGH SS RL*, pp. 234-64.

Erchempert probably intended the title of his work to be the *Hystoriola Langobardorum Beneventum*, a phrase used in c. 1, p. 235, l.1, Erchempert's 'Little History' was thus contrasted with Paul the Deacon's greater work: Taviani-Carozzi, *Salerno*, I, p. 37.

²³The poem's association with Erchempert was for a time doubted but U. Westerbergh, *Beneventan Ninth Century Poetry*, (Studia Latina Stockholmiensia III; Lund, 1956), pp. 8-29 made a decisive case for its link to the rest of the work.

²⁴Ed. U. Westerbergh, *Chronicon Salernitanum* (Studia Latina Stockholmiensia III), Lund 1956, pp. xviii, xix; N. Cilento, 'Di Marino Freccia Erudito Napoletano del Cinquecento e di Alcuni Codici di Cronache Medievali a lui Noti', *BISl* 68 (1956), pp. 281-310, at 302, [repr. in *Italia Meridionale Longobarda* (1963) retitled 'La Tradizione manoscritta di Erchemperto e del Chronicon Salernitanum', pp. 73-102].

²⁵Taviani-Carozzi, *Salerno* pp. 39-40.

²⁶Erchempert, pp. 250-64.

²⁷Virtually every work concerned with ninth century southern Italy is compelled to use Erchempert, often uncritically - most recently, with refs., B. Kreutz, *Southern Italy Before the Normans*, (1991), esp. pp. 18-55.

²⁸Erchempert's claim to hold property in Pilano in 881 (c. 44, p. 254, ll.9-11) has caused much discussion of the nature of his monasticism and social position: W. Klewitz, 'Petrus Diaconus und die Montecassinenser Klosterchronik des Leo von Ostia', *Archiv für Urkundenforschung* 14 (1936), pp. 414-53 argued Erchempert could not hold property under the Rule of Benedict and therefore may not have

apart from the few pages in general histories of early medieval literature and the scattered references in the works of Cilento, only as recently as 1991 did Taviani-Carozzi produce the first, very brief, real attempt to consider Erchempert's work in its own right.²⁹ More recently still Capo attempted to fit Erchempert into a 'Lombard' tradition of historical writing,³⁰ an idea, however first suggested by Bethmann.³¹ The exception to this historiographical pattern has been the analysis devoted to the anonymous mid-tenth century *Chronicon Salernitanum*. This later southern Italian text drew heavily on Erchempert but radically reworked parts of his account. Unfortunately, however, attention has been so focused on these reworkings and on the peculiarities of the *Chronicon Salernitanum* that Erchempert's work has been treated almost exclusively in terms of its role as a source rather than as an independent history. The interest of the scholars working in this way has been upon Erchempert as the exemplar from which the *Chronicon* diverged. As such their methods have concentrated on drawing conclusions about the *Chronicon Salernitanum*.³² Erchempert has been cast as 'the straight man'.³³ Very little

been a monk, and that the information concerning Erchempert may have been interpolated, a view rightly dismissed by P. Meyvaert, 'Erchempert, Moine du Mont Cassin', *Revue Benedictine* 69 (1959), pp. 101-5. Taviani-Carozzi, *Salerne*, pp. 46-51, has argued that there is no incompatibility in this position under Lombard law but she can cite only Paul the Deacon from an earlier period (whose position is also unclear, cf. W. Goffart, *Narrators*, pp. 334-8) and then eleventh-century examples whose date makes them unsatisfactory. M. Oldoni, 'Erchemperto', *DBI*, vol. 43 (1993), pp. 66-8, is the most cautious and currently acceptable view, that Erchempert's noble status is not explicit in the text and his monastic position uncertain before he refers to his activity on behalf of Montecassino in 887.

²⁹Taviani-Carozzi, *Salerne*, pp. 51-62.

³⁰Capo, 'Polemica', pp. 15-17, esp. 16.

³¹Bethmann, 'Geschichtschreibung', pp. 374-5.

³²D. Bianchi, 'Da Paolo Diacono all'Anonimo Salernitano', *Memorie Storiche Forogiuliesi* XXXIII (1937), pp. 27-64 is the earliest effort, of moderate value; cf. N. Cilento, 'La Struttura del Racconto nelle cronache Benedittino-Cassinesi della Langobardia Meridionale nei secc. IX e X', *BISI* 73 (1961) pp. 85-112, at 98-102 [repr. as 'I cronisti della Langobardia Minore', in his collected essays *Italia Meridionale Longobarda*, (Naples, Milan, 1966), pp. 40-64]; P. Delogu, *Mito di Una Città: Salerno dall'VIII al XI Secolo*, (Salerno, 1978), ch. 2 uses the evidence from the *Chronicon Salernitanum* to attempt a reconstruction of mid-tenth century Salernitan society; cf. the admiring comments of Kreutz, *Italy*, p. 95.

³³E.g. J. Gay, *L'Italie Meridionale et l'Empire Byzantine*, (New York, 1960), p. 595, considers the CS 'assurement plus pittoresque et plus vivante que la sèche et triste histoire du moine Erchempert'; M. Oldoni, *Anonimo Salernitano del X Secolo*, (Naples, 1972), *passim*, but e.g., p. 87 writes of 'l'asciuttà consequenzialità della prosa erchempertiana...'; p. 89 'l'irreversibile continuità espositiva dell' *Ystoriola*'; p. 90, 'la caduta ininterrotta dei capitoli di Erchemperto'.

attention has been devoted to the question of Erchempert's own literary structure and strategies.

Aspects of Erchempert's biases have long been understood. He was a Lombard and the main thrust of his writings concerns the history of the Lombards in southern Italy after 774, with particular emphasis on the principality of Benevento created by Arichis II and Grimoald III in the last quarter of the eighth century. Erchempert appears to have seen the independent Lombards of southern Italy as the continuators of the Lombard tradition. He never refers to any figure from the *regnum italiae* as a Lombard and describes Carolingian armies, generically, as *Franci* or *Galli* without distinguishing those from north of the Alps from 'Italians'. One might expect him therefore to be hostile to the Carolingians but in fact his attitude is somewhat more complex. [See below.] Erchempert was hostile to many of the other participants in events in southern Italy, such as the Salernitans and Capuans, despite the Salernitans' Lombard origin. For Erchempert legitimacy lay with the Beneventan polity and especially the two dynasties firstly, of Arichis and, from the mid-ninth century, of Adelchis II. The dedicatee of the *Hystoriola*, Aio, proved to be the last member of this latter dynasty.³⁴

Erchempert was therefore writing about the territory in which he lived and often, in the later parts of his chronicle about events through which he had lived. It has often been supposed therefore that he was particularly *engagé*³⁵ and this seems true. However if his involvement enhances his reliability about later ninth-century events, it says little about the earlier part of his chronicle. Taviani-Carozzi has tried to argue that Erchempert drew his information from elderly monks at Montecassino.³⁶ This may be correct³⁷ (Erchempert suggests so himself) but it is impossible to show which passages might rely on such

³⁴Taviani-Carozzi, *Salerno*, pp. 60-2.

³⁵Cilento, 'Struttura', p. 99; Oldoni, 'Erchemperto', p. 69.

³⁶Taviani-Carozzi, *Salerno*, pp. 40, 43-5.

³⁷However the derivation of reliable tradition from elders is also something of a topos in early medieval authors: Paul the Deacon's *Historia Langobardorum* and Agnellus of Ravenna both include it. Cf. Martinez Pizarro, *Writing Ravenna*, pp. 71-6, esp. 74-6 which shows Agnellus's misrepresentation of written sources as oral.

sources and even so merely puts back a stage the problem of the bias or reliability of such evidence. Moreover a consideration of the opening chapters of Erchempert suggests that his text is not without artifice.

In fact the opening ten chapters appear as two units. Cc. 1-6 introduce the history and deal with the relations of Benevento under Arichis (760-787) and Grimoald (788-817) with the Franks and Byzantines. This account appears to be a description of Benevento's survival and growing independence from 774 down to c. 817 - for Erchempert something of a golden age when the Lombards of the south were united and strong.³⁸ Chapters 2, 5, 6 describe Beneventan resistance to Frankish attacks, and chapters 3 and 4 respectively Arichis's building programme and Grimoald's return from Francia where he had been a hostage. After describing Benevento's stormy but ultimately triumphant history in this period Erchempert in ccs. 7-10 turns to the events following Grimoald's death and Benevento's less sure-footed activity in southern Italy.

This account is essentially chronological. It contains several interesting points. Pippin of Italy's installation as sub-king of Italy is recorded (781).³⁹ Later in Erchempert's account Pippin claims authority over Benevento by referring to the precedent of Desiderius's supposed authority over Arichis. I think it highly unlikely that Pippin can have issued any such claim. In the text Grimoald rejects Pippin's claim with the proud assertion that *liber et ingenuus sum natus et... semper ero liber, credo*.⁴⁰ The passage comes at the end of the section of Erchempert's account detailing Franko-Beneventan relations. Grimoald's rebuttal can stand as a statement of Benevento's independence. In this respect it fulfills the literary purpose of bracketing-off the opening part of the history from the next section dealing with Benevento in its southern Italian context. It is not only a rejection of the Franks but of domination by the north Italian kingdom in general and is

³⁸Taviani-Carozzi, *Salerno*, p. 53.

³⁹Erchempert, p. 235, c. 2, ll. 10-11: *Igitur capta et subiugata Carlo Italia, Pipinum filio suum illuc regem constituit*.

⁴⁰Erchempert, c. 6, p. 237, ll. 3-4.

therefore a continuation of Benevento's pre-774 attitude of quasi-independence towards Pavia.⁴¹ Note that the claim is couched in terms of the personal relationship of the rulers in question. It is significant that it is Pippin and not Charlemagne who made the declaration. Pippin's claimed authority derived from the equivalence of his and Desiderius's position rather than from Frankish dominance. Erchempert had certainly read Paul the Deacon and would have known his account of Benevento's distinct path in the seventh and eighth centuries.⁴² This episode thus marks Benevento's successful sloughing-off of the impositions of the north. This is confirmed elsewhere. Taviani-Carozzi has noted Erchempert's parallelism of Benevento and Pavia as *gemina*, the twin centres of Lombard tradition, in Erchempert's dedicatory poem.⁴³ This extends to the very earliest part of the text. Erchempert prefaces Pippin's claims with the words that when Pippin was reigning in Pavia and Grimoald governing in Benevento there was frequent warfare between them.⁴⁴ Erchempert's reports in c. 6 are the only ones to deal with Pippin (except for a brief notice of his installation by Charlemagne) and support the view that for Erchempert this episode concerns Beneventan resistance not only to domination by the Franks but also from Pavia in general. It also of course does show something of Erchempert's negative attitude towards Frankish domination. Erchempert emphasizes the almost constant warfare the Franks inflicted upon Benevento. This is attributed to Charlemagne rather than Pippin. Divine favour protected the Beneventans and struck down many of Charlemagne's army with plague.⁴⁵

⁴¹It's probably wise to doubt whether the relationship Erchempert imputes that Pippin believed existed between Desiderius and Arichis actually did: for a narrative see: Bertolini 'Carlomagno', pp. 656, 662-4.

⁴²On Paul's account of Benevento see Goffart, *Narrators*, pp. 329-433, but esp. e.g. 406-7, 414-16, 422-3.

⁴³Taviani-Carozzi, *Salerno*, pp. 53, 62, concerning dedicatory poem.

⁴⁴Erchempert, c. 6, p. 236, ll. 33-5: *Unde factum est, ut, Pipino regnante in Ticino et Grimoaldo presidente in Benevento, frequentissimum bellum vexaret Beneventanos...*

⁴⁵Erchempert, c. 6, p. 236, ll. 30-1: *Frequenter autem Karlus cum cunctis liberis,...et cum immenso bellatorum agmine Beneventum preliaturis aggreditur; set Deo decertante pro nobis, sub cuius adhuc regimine fovebamur, innumerabilis de suis peste perditis, cum paucis nonnunquam inglorius revertebatur.*

Before this the effect of Frankish influence was clearly signalled by Erchempert. Grimoald had married 'Wantia', according to Erchempert the *neptis augusti Achivorum*. But this political alliance foundered on mutual dislike. In Erchempert's version a Frankish attack furnished the opportunity (*occasione*) for Grimoald to repudiate her.⁴⁶ This episode has been the subject of considerable interest because it is one of the relatively few events confirmed by outside sources. The Byzantine princess in question was in fact Evanzia, the sister-in-law of Constantine VI, according to the *Vita S. Philarete* written in 821/2 by her relative, Niketas in Paphlagonia.⁴⁷ The exact date of this repudiation is a complicated problem. Grimoald's repudiation of her may have been intended to demonstrate loyalty to the Franks.⁴⁸ Bertolini suggests it occurred c. 795 but this seems too late; by this stage Benevento had already broken with Charlemagne⁴⁹ and Grimoald could ill afford to alienate Byzantium. Speck argues for 788-91 because he dates as *post quem* an attack by Pippin in 791,⁵⁰ but just such an attack according to Erchempert provided Grimoald with his excuse for dismissing Evanzia, hence either the Frankish campaign of 787 or one of those of the 790s seems most likely. However for the reason given above a date in the 790s is unlikely. A date c. 788 seems most probable on the basis that at least superficially Grimoald was then following a pro-Frankish policy and the one thing a repudiation of a Byzantine imperial bride cannot have represented was a rapprochement with Constantinople. Erchempert does not appear to have known the Byzantine source. He mistakes the relationship of Evanzia to the emperor. Conversely Niketas too makes mistakes.⁵¹ Perhaps Erchempert has only slightly misunderstood the family relationships in

⁴⁶Bertolini, 'Carlomagno', p. 664.

⁴⁷Ed. & commentary M-H. Fourmy & M. Leroy, 'La Vie de S. Philarète', *Byzantion* 9 (1934), pp. 85-167, text at 112-167, here 143, and cf. comments pp. 104-8.

⁴⁸Bertolini, 'Carlomagno', pp. 663-4.

⁴⁹See below ch V pp. 183f. for a full discussion of this event.

⁵⁰Bertolini, 'Carlomagno', p. 662-3 gives 795; K. Speck, *Konstantin VI: Die Legitimation einer Fremden und der Versuch einer eigenen Herrschaft*, (Munich, 1978) vol. I, p. 208 gives but this seems improbable given Erchempert's statement that it was just such an attack which enabled Grimoald to reject Evanzia.

⁵¹Conversely Niketas mistook Evanzia's intended husband; the Ἀργουσις he refers to must be Arichis, who however, was married and must have sought Evanzia's hand for his son, cf. Fourmy & Leroy 'Philarete', pp. 104-5; Bertolini, 'Carlomagno', p. 662; Speck, *Konstantin VI*, p. 208.

the case. Evanzia would have been the *nepta* of Irene, although the noun *augustus* is in the wrong gender. Erchempert's version is weak on the Byzantine material but convincing in its account of the Beneventan view of these events. Unsurprisingly the reverse is true for Niketas's *vita*.

Chapters 11-19 contain almost no information about the Carolingians except in c. 11 a misplaced reference to the division of the empire on Louis the Pious's death (actually the division as settled after Fontenoy). The Arab attack recorded at the opening of the chapter is dated to 832, and the events narrated afterwards in chapters 12 forward refer to the years from 834-9. Since Erchempert is usually fairly chronologically reliable the positioning of the Carolingian succession arrangements out of sequence is, I think, part of a broader pattern. As Taviani-Carozzi has noted the imperial interventions in southern Italy lead Erchempert to introduce into the text a description of the Carolingian succession following Lothar I's death and preceding the formal and permanent division of Benevento. As Taviani-Carozzi realized Erchempert had modified his chronology to make it appear that the Carolingians (specifically Louis II) were responsible for the division of the principality of Benevento (which Erchempert opposed) by placing this division after Lothar's death (855) whereas it actually took place rather earlier, c. 849.⁵² It is possible that Erchempert reordered the chronology because he merely assumed that for Louis II to play any role in the south he must have already succeeded his father. I think this unlikely however because of the parallel with the similar episode in c.11, not considered by Taviani-Carozzi, in which Erchempert textually associates the Carolingians and the Arabs, although in c.11, unlike c.19, the Carolingians are only recorded alongside the Arabs, not actually involved with them. Alternatively one might think that Erchempert was thus placing together his accounts of two foreign peoples who both had an important effect in southern Lombard Italy. Certainly Taviani-Carozzi was right to divine an association in the text of the Arabs with the Carolingians, since later, for Erchempert the main function

⁵²Taviani-Carozzi, *Salerno*, p. 57.

of the empire was to deal with the Arab threat. In the two chapters in question Erchempert on both occasions (although only implicitly in c.11) associates a Carolingian succession with Arab attacks on Italy. However in c.19 Louis II, at the request of Landolf of Capua, successfully launches a counter-attack, perhaps a presage of his future success. C.19 can also only be read in the light of c.20 in which Louis II again lead a sortie against the Arabs, at the request of the abbots of S. Vincenzo al Volturno and Montecassino.⁵³ The linking of the Carolingians and the Arabs in Erchempert's text from the very beginning (or at least from c.11 onwards) probably indicates his attitude towards them as two groups of outsiders who interpose themselves into his territory. Both of these earliest interventions of Louis II are at the request of southern Italians.

These scattered references are Erchempert's only direct references to the Carolingians except for cs. 32-4, the single most detailed and important section of the *Hystoriola* about the Carolingians, specifically concerning Louis II in southern Italy between 866-71. These campaigns made a great impact in Italy generally, as Andreas of Bergamo's emphasis on them shows.⁵⁴ In c. 29 Erchempert reintroduced the Franks into his narrative when referring to the dispatch of an *exercitus Gallorum* which returned to the north having achieved nothing.⁵⁵ This force's origin is not clear; it may have been imperial but it may equally (perhaps more probably) be a reference to the force, put together by Lambert of Spoleto, Garard of Marso⁵⁶ and three gastalds, which attacked the Arabs on their return from extorting 'protection money' from S. Vincenzo al Volturno and Montecassino⁵⁷. Erchempert's claim that the army returned having achieved nothing precedes his account of Lambert's failure and it is unclear whether the two formations are the same. Unfortunately Louis II's whereabouts in 860 and 862 are difficult to establish. He was at

⁵³Unsuccessfully: Kreutz, *Italy*, p. 37.

⁵⁴Andreas of Bergamo, *MGH SS RL*, cc. 12, 14-16, pp. 227-8.

⁵⁵Erchempert, c. 29, p. 245, ll. 20-1: *Quam ob rem et Gallorum exercitus crebrius adveniens eorum efferitatem opprimendam, set nihil proficiens, via qua venerat repedabat.*

⁵⁶Erchempert, p. 245, n. 5.

⁵⁷Kreutz, *Italy*, p. 38, who also dates the events of c. 29 to 862 rather than Waitz's marginal suggestion of '860'.

Marengo (in the Po valley) on October 7, 860.⁵⁸ No documents definitely to be attributed to 862 survive for Louis although there are several possibly of that year.⁵⁹ It seems unlikely that he could have led the campaign himself, even if an imperial army was involved at all.⁶⁰

Cc. 31-2 concern the machinations leading to Louis II's invitation to return to the south at the request of Pandonulf of Capua. These two chapters are therefore essentially context to explain the situation bringing about renewed imperial interventions. Louis's return to the south in 866 is described in some detail by Erchempert. Louis, accompanied by his wife Angilberga, stopped en route at Montecassino where he was met by the abbot Bertarit and the *legati de diversis urbibus*.⁶¹ Landolf compelled the Capuans to fly the monastery however in a reprise of the internal divisions which beset the southern Lombards throughout Erchempert's history. Erchempert thus reminds the reader of the general situation in the south.

In c.33 Louis turns towards the prime objective of his campaign against the Arabs. most of the events described in c. 33 occurred in 867. There is then a leap forwards (not signalled in the text) to Louis II's capture in 871. C.33's account of Louis's campaigns is very positive. The Arab forces of 'Saugdan' were defeated although they were able to go on pillaging towns on the far southern coast of Italy (in the peninsula's 'instep') such as Matera, Venosa, Canosa and Ocera⁶². Erchempert's description of refugees fleeing to the emperor is significant because it finds powerful continuations in the following chapter. The emperor 'with his usual mercy' did not refuse these people.⁶³ Clearly a strong element of

⁵⁸DLII no. 31, pp. 127-32.

⁵⁹DLII, nos. 35, pp. 137-9, Mantua Feb. 26 (861, 862); no. 36, pp.139-42 Mantua March 6 (861, 862); no. 37, pp. 142-3, Parma Sept. 19 (860, 862, 863).

⁶⁰In 860 Louis was certainly in Verona at least once: BMZ no. 182, p. 76; Zielinski places Louis in the south in 862 but does not use Erchempert's reference to reinforce any of the dates: BMZ nos. 183-8, pp. 77-8. The matter remains for now partly unresolved.

⁶¹Erchempert, p. 246, ll. 38f, CSBC, p. 471; Kreutz, *Italy*, p. 40.

⁶²BMZ nos. 275-7, pp. 113-14 for these four towns.

⁶³Erchempert, p. 247, c. 33, ll.15-16: *multi ad augustalem confugientes clementiam dari sibi petebant dextas; quibus tunc solitam misericordiam [non] denegat.*

imperial ideology had been circulated in the south: the emperor as protector of the weak, an image also frequent in capitularies.

Erchempert follows this up in c. 34 in his account of Louis's imprisonment by Adelchis of Benevento. Erchempert's opening lines in this chapter portray the success of Louis's campaigns as acting as an incentive to the Devil to bring about trouble. Louis is called 'a most holy man, the saviour of the provinces of Benevento'.⁶⁴ His imprisonment causes a stirring of the 'Ismaelites' who rise up again to strike at Africa. Erchempert's invocation of diabolical intervention is also found in some of our other sources about Louis's imprisonment and the attacks of the Arabs.⁶⁵ That Louis's success could prompt diabolical intervention indicates something of the very large scale Erchempert felt the emperor worked upon. Erchempert also blames Louis. Taviani-Carozzi argues that for Erchempert this episode is above all an opportunity to display the workings of divine justice. The Beneventans suffer for their crime in imprisoning the emperor but Louis did not suffer this punishment without reason. The Franks had severely oppressed the Beneventans and thus provoked them to rebellion.⁶⁶ Moreover claims Taviani-Carozzi it was Louis's failure to kill the captive infidel Saugdan and, on another occasion, the emperor's intention to beat priests⁶⁷ which brought down God's vengeance upon him. Thus Erchempert's account is not simply a reprise of Carolingian (or Beneventan) propaganda but a moral narrative. Erchempert sought to frame the events of 871 in the terms of Biblical phrases, possibly to be understood as prophecies. As a preface to the attack of the Arabs following Louis's capture the text quotes Zachariah: 'smite the shepherd and the flock shall be scattered'⁶⁸ whose meaning in this context is obvious - the emperor in this case understood as shepherd, the flock being the southern Lombards. The obvious Christological significance

⁶⁴Erchempert, p. 247, c. 34, ll. 25-6: *...sanctissimum virum, salvatorem scilicet Beneventenae provinciae..*

⁶⁵Cf. below ch. IV pp. 151.

⁶⁶Erchempert, p. 247, c. 34, ll. 23-4: *Galli graviter Beneventanos persequi ac crudeliter vexare; qua de re Adelgisus princeps adversus Lodogicum augustum erectus cum suis*; Taviani-Carozzi, *Salerno*, p. 58.

⁶⁷Erchempert, c. 37, pp. 248-9; Taviani-Carozzi, *Salerno*, pp. 58-9. Cf *libellus*, p. 721=ed. Zucchetti, p. 204.

⁶⁸Zachariah, 13, 7.

of the idea of the Shepherd is not explicitly exploited here by Erchempert as it was, for example in the Verona *Rhythmus de Ludowico*⁶⁹ with its strongly-apparent Christ/Louis parallels,⁷⁰ but then the textual context of Erchempert's use of the idea is very different. What is striking is that two decades after the events depicted Erchempert should choose to use the concept at all in a work dedicated to an independent ruler of Benevento - an indication perhaps of Louis II's strong image in the south.

Lastly in c. 36 Erchempert refers to Louis's distant influence. Landolf bishop of Capua, one of Erchempert's villains, was established by the emperor 'as third in the kingdom'. This was because Louis wished to 'acquire' Benevento.⁷¹ In the end, then, Louis was revealed as a would-be oppressor who sought to work via a tool as appalling as Landulf. Louis's hopes of 'acquiring' Benevento mirror his fundamentally greedy Frankish nature⁷² and perhaps enable Erchempert to accept the events of 871 with better grace since in the end they applied to a Louis who is a somewhat dubious figure rather than 'the saviour of the province of Benevento'. This chapter also acts as a precursor to Erchempert's account of Louis's deficiencies in c. 37 where the emperor's willingness to do violence to clerics and his failure to kill the infidel leader Saugdan are held up against him.⁷³ Erchempert is not interested in the merciful ruler here but instead cites as a precedent Joshua's willingness to kill the Amalekite leader.⁷⁴

The imperial image is more important to Erchempert's narrative than in, for example, Agnellus but the Carolingians are still not the focus of the account, as in, say, the *ARF*. The intervention of the Carolingians, in particular Louis II, affected the southern Lombards (and south Italy generally) in a way too profound to be omitted. But the

⁶⁹MGH *Poetae Latini Aevi Carolini* III, ed. L. Traube, pp. 404-5; and below ch. IV, pp. 148f..

⁷⁰J. Szövérfy, *Weltliche Dichtungen des Lateinischen Mittelalters*, (Berlin, 1970), pp. 681-2.

⁷¹Erchempert, c. 36, p. 248, ll. 18-19, 21: *per idem tempus iam dictus cesar [Louis] Landulfum in familiaritatem alliciens, tertium in regno suo constituit...Lodoguicus autem volens Beneventum acquirere...*

⁷²See below note 76.

⁷³See n. 68.

⁷⁴Erchempert, c. 37, p. 249; I Kings, 15; Taviani-Carozzi, *Salerno*, p. 58.

Carolingians remain outsiders, the leaders of *Franci* or *Galli* (although not the only ones - the dukes of Spoleto are also described thus⁷⁵) invited to intervene by the southern Lombards themselves. The emphasis throughout is on the Carolingians's military role. Although Erchempert reproduces flashes of propaganda it is hard to be certain whether these show the influence of Carolingian ideology or the more general circulation of ideas concerning rulership. Certain features were common to claims of good rulership (piety, protection of the poor, the upholding of law, prestige buildings etc.⁷⁶) These common ideas derived perhaps from a common tradition of Roman imperial (and even Lombard royal ?) ideology. The significant point however is that these ideas were associated in the text with the Carolingians, indicating that Erchempert found this linkage natural, particularly at any point of crisis like Louis II's imprisonment. Erchempert's main interest in the Carolingians hinged on their efficacy as protectors of the south. In this sense he saw Louis II as the most positive figure; Charlemagne and Pippin on the other hand are perceived as would-be oppressors attempting to reduce Benevento to subservience, a model to which Louis II eventually succumbs also. Significantly for Erchempert even Spoletans are called *Galli* or *Franci* - true Lombards only exist in the south, where they had preserved their independence. This reinforces the sense that the Carolingians are considered outsiders. Nevertheless the ultimate role of the Carolingians for Erchempert was, as Taviani-Carozzi has argued,⁷⁷ destructive. The division of Benevento in c.850,

⁷⁵Erchempert, c. 17, p. 241, ll. 20-2: Guy of Spoleto offered his troops as mercenaries *pro cupiditate tamen pecuniarum, quibus maxime Francorum subiciter gens*, a further demonstration both of Erchempert's anti-Frankish sentiments and of his view that Spoletans were Franks; E. Hlawitschka, 'Die politischen Intentionen der Widonen im Dukat von Spoleto', *Atti del 9° Congresso di Studi sull'alto Medioevo*, (Spoleto, 1983), pp. 123-47 at 127-8.

⁷⁶The ideological palette, at least in so far as it can be reconstructed for Italy used a limited number of approaches. On Benevento: H. Belting, 'Studien zum beneventanischen Hof im 8 Jahrhundert', *Dumbarton Oaks Papers*, XVI (1962), pp. 141-93. To the best of my knowledge little has yet been done on late ninth century Beneventan legislation (i.e. Adelchis II) except Martin, *La Pouille*, pp. 235-7; and on symbolism in this legislation: S. Gasparri's intro. to ed. Azzara, *Leggi dei Longobardi*, p. xxxiv, which emphasizes the Christian element in ninth-century Beneventan laws. Although limited for this subject, M. McCormick, *Eternal Victory. Triumphal Rulership in Late Antiquity, Byzantium and the Early Medieval West*, (Cambridge, 1986), pp. 284-97 provides the best current overview of Lombard royal ideology; cf. pp. 328-84 on Frankish ideology.

⁷⁷Taviani-Carozzi, *Salerno*, pp. 60-1.

promoted by the Carolingians, ended prospects for Lombard unity, a project dear to Erchempert. Louis II's intervention was mostly important in Erchempert's text because it set the stage for the last serious attempt at uniting the southern Lombards in the 880s. Its failure, alluded to in the opening lines of the history, forms the leitmotiv of the work.⁷⁸ In this sense the Carolingians acted as, in part, the unwitting agents of destruction.⁷⁹ Erchempert's view takes this into consideration. An awareness of the complexity of the situation is clear throughout the work. He makes no generalizations about the dynasty. In this sense Erchempert does not have a view of '*the Carolingians*' as a unit, (other than as potential overlords and even here Louis II is only attributed this trait at the very end of an otherwise positive account, perhaps as little more than justification for his expulsion from southern Italy) only of individual Carolingian rulers in their southern Italian context. Thus the attribution of elements of ideology to Carolingian figures (clearly, in Erchempert's case this means essentially Louis II) suggests that these concepts had either a purely personal association or one with rulership generally, not just Carolingian rulership. (Let us recall that Erchempert had other rulers in mind in his text, particularly princes of Benevento and Lombard kings). The Carolingians' intermittent influence in the south ensured that their impact was very personal and developed little continuity. This appears to be reflected in Erchempert's text.

Vita Athanasii: It is unusual to find the Carolingians mentioned in Italian hagiography. This *vita*⁸⁰ is an exception and must be read alongside the *GEN* [below]. Athanasius I bishop of Naples' close relationship with Louis II brings the emperor into the foreground of the text which was apparently commissioned by Athanasius's nephew and successor, bishop Athanasius II (877-), and was written shortly after Athanasius I's death in 877; an

⁷⁸Erchempert, c. 1, p. 235-6: *...ego Erchempert...praecipueque ab Adelgiso, insigni sagacique virum, ystoriolam condere Langobardorum Beneventum degentium, de quibus quia his diebus nil dignum ac laudabile repperitur, quod veraci valeat stilo exarari, idcirco non regimen eorum set excidium, non felicitatem set miseriam, non triumphum set perniciem...*; Taviani-Carozzi, *Salerno*, p. 38.

⁷⁹Taviani-Carozzi, *Salerno*, pp. 59-61.

⁸⁰MGH SS RL, ed. Waitz, pp. 439-49.

account of his funeral was provided in a slightly later addition.⁸¹ The author is unknown although unconvincing attempts have been made to identify him with Guarimpotus, a Neapolitan translator of Greek hagiographies.⁸²

The Carolingians first appear in relation to duke Sergius I who was so endowed with virtues (prudence, modesty and patience in this case) that as soon as Gregory IV (827-44) became pope so Sergius with the *serenissimos viros Lodoicum piissimum cognomento Almunum eiusque sobolem Lutharium invictissimos cesares familiarissimus esset maximumque optineret honoris locum, quoniam frequentius eorum iura regalia adibat...*⁸³ Interestingly the association between Sergius and Gregory IV is explicit. Both were involved in attempts to prevent Arab attacks in southeastern Italy; Neapolitan ships under the command of Sergius's son strove to protect Rome in 842 and, less successfully, 846⁸⁴ and Sergius and the next pope are associated in the 846 capitulary. The great 'honours' Sergius acquired from the Carolingians are hard to ascertain. Certainly the 846 capitulary refers in very warm terms to Sergius. Neapolitan posterity clearly wasn't embarrassed to recall Sergius's association with the Carolingians despite his deals with the Arabs and lukewarm support for the Christian emperor in the the 850s.⁸⁵ Writing in the late 870s after Louis II had done so much to stabilize the position of the Christian statelets in the south the link with the Carolingians was once more one to be played up. This is particularly so since Sergius's *familiaritas* is a quality he shared with his son Athanasius [below], the hagiographer's object.

However most of the references to the Carolingians in Athanasius's *vita* concern Louis II. *Lodoycus piissimus augustus* went to Benevento and Naples at the intervention of the

⁸¹MGH SS RL, ed. Waitz, pp. 449f.

⁸²P. Devos, 'L'oeuvre de Guarimpotus, Hagiographe Napolitain', *Analecta Bollandiana* 76 (1958), pp. 151-87, supported by Cilento, *SNapoli* II.2, pp. 586-7 [repr. in his collected essays *Italia Meridionale Longobarda*, (Naples. 1963), pp. 66-7] and roundly dismissed by W. Berschin, *Greek Letters and the Latin Middle Ages*, (1988, New York) p. 170.

⁸³*Vita Athanasii*, p. 441, ll. 28-30.

⁸⁴Eickhoff, *Seekrieg*, pp. 180-3.

⁸⁵On Naples's dealings with the Arabs see Eickhoff, *Seekrieg*, pp. 180-2; cf. the brief comments by F. Luzzati Laganà, 'Il ducato di Napoli', *Il Mezzogiorno dai Bizantini a Federico II*, (Turin, 1983), p. 334.

Neapolim legatis Athanasius. The bishop, *hic venerandus vir pro suorum civium salute frequentissime adiit cesaream celsitudinem, a qua officiosissime excipiebatur ob pia famae rumorem et sanctitatis reverentiam, qua non mediocriter pollebat.*⁸⁶

Unsurprisingly in a hagiographical work,⁸⁷ Athanasius's intercessory power relied on the fame of his sanctity. This passage emphasizes Athanasius's care for his flock, rather than Louis's role. The relationship between the two figures however continues in the next passage where Louis acts as the bishop's protector. Louis, informed of Athanasius's troubles in Naples, *doluit ex intimo corde una cum augusta* (perhaps a reflection of that *familiaritas* attributed to the bishop ?) and despatched Marinus of Amalfi to bring Athanasius to Benevento. The imperial couple (*augusti*) sought to 'diligently comfort him about everything' when he came into their presence.⁸⁸

Lastly the *vita* records the imprisonment of Louis II in Benevento, represented here as the Beneventans being *inspirati a demone...comprehenderunt Lodoycum virum pium, liberatorem scilicet Benebentanae provinciae, et custodiis manciparunt.*

Subsequently Naples was placed under anathema; the bishop went to pope Hadrian II to have it lifted and then to Louis, now in Ravenna after his release.⁸⁹ The emperor (here referred to simply as *cesar*) sent his *optimates* to greet Athanasius and kissed the prelate when they met. The bishop, accompanied by Landulf of Capua, had come in fact to plead with Louis to intervene in the south again because of the renewed intensity of Arab attacks. Calling him again *liberator patriae nostrae* but also *dominus* he begged Louis to overlook the sins committed against him as had Christ. Louis *inclinatus est* by the words and gifts of Athanasius accompanied the prelate to Rome to the basilica of the Holy Apostles, gave gifts 'to God and his apostle'

⁸⁶*Vita Athanasii*, p. 444, c. 5, ll. 32-38.

⁸⁷Cf. Löwe, *DG IV*, p. 442 which characterizes the *vita* as a work of local patriotism.

⁸⁸*Vita Athanasii*, p. 446, c. 7, ll. 33f

⁸⁹*Vita Athanasii*, p. 448, l. 20 says *Sabina* but *ibid.* Waitz, n. 3 points to *GEN*'s reference to Ravenna: cf. BMZ no. 344, p. 141.

and then began to accompany Athanasius to his see. The emperor, tired by the journey stopped at Berulo, however and Athanasius, who proceeded on his way, died soon after.⁹⁰

One interesting point concerning the *vita* is that some of the epithets applied to the Carolingians are similar to the titles in imperial charters. Louis the Pious is referred to as *serenissimos* and *piissimum*, the two concluding formulae used in his charters; Lothar as *invictissimos*, the concluding adjective of his charters from 822-25; Louis II as *piissimus augustus*, the closing formula of his documents between 855-66. Furthermore Louis II was addressed as *dominus*. This perhaps indicates that Carolingian documents were available to the author. Athanasius was initially buried at Montecassino (his remains were moved to Naples some years later). Possibly the author used documents from the abbey archives. Unfortunately no charters of Louis the Pious are known at Montecassino and only one of Lothar I, and although it seems very likely that Louis II issued charters there on his frequent visits none survive.⁹¹ Since the epithet *invictissimos* was also adopted by Louis II between 851-66⁹² in the *arengae* of his charters, and the description both *piissimus* (before 866) and *serenissimos* (after 866) were used in the closing protocol of his documents⁹³ it may only be Louis II's documents which have provided the author of the *vita* with inspiration. However the use of the term *cesar* [sic] which does not appear in any Italian charter perhaps suggests that the author was looking for epithets to describe the Carolingians.

Gesta Episcoporum Neapolitanorum (GEN): This account⁹⁴ of the bishops of Naples composed in that city was, rather like the *CSBC*, written in three sections: the first in the late eighth century,⁹⁵ the second, the only section which concerns us, by John the Deacon

⁹⁰*Vita Athanasii*, p. 448, ll.25f.

⁹¹*DLo* no. 24, pp. 96-8, original still preserved at Montecassino. Cf *DLII* no. 62, pp. 187-9 the only Louis II Cassino charter the editor thinks possibly authentic.

⁹²*DLII* nos. 1-16, pp. 67-97.

⁹³*DLII* *passim*.

⁹⁴*GEN*, ed. Waitz, *MGH SS RL*, pp. 398-434.

⁹⁵This is the conventional dating: Waitz and subsequent authors - see next note. Contra D. Mallardo, *La Storia Antica della Chiesa di Napoli*, (Naples, 19), pp. 33-6. Balzani, *Cronache*, p. 96 dismisses this

between 898-907 describing the years 762-872 and the third, a very short later fragment.⁹⁶ Since the main focus is on Naples itself the Carolingians appear only as marginal figures except, as ever, Louis II. But unlike the *CSBC* he is not the only Carolingian in the text.

The earliest reference to Charlemagne concerns the conquest of the Lombard kingdom. The *GEN*'s account muddles events of 773-4 with the journey to Frankia by pope Stephen III in the 750s, who was dead by 768 and played no part in the fall of the Lombard kingdom.⁹⁷ There is a brief account of the imperial coronation in 800. It is very close to the *LP*'s version of events,⁹⁸ although with a dash more cynicism - the pope offers to 'crown Charles with the imperial diadem' 'if he will protect him [Leo] from his enemies'.⁹⁹ Like the *LP* the *GEN* refers to Leo being assaulted and blinded in one eye (perhaps as a way of explaining the contradiction in *LP* that later Leo can see),¹⁰⁰ but unlike the *LP* it presents Charlemagne's entry into Rome as a conquest.¹⁰¹ The *GEN* does not pursue this matter although it follows up the imperial coronation with a report concerning Byzantine imperial politics.¹⁰² One assumes it was inserted in the narrative as a 'great event' worth recording rather than because it had any direct bearing on Naples. This is not true for the other episodes concerning the Carolingians.

section as 'una arida compilazione'. (regrettably Mallardo's *Ricerche di Storia e di Topografia degli Antichi Cimiteri Cristiani di Napoli*, (Naples, 1936), pp. 77-80 was unavailable to me.).

⁹⁶Löwe, *DG* IV, pp. 440-2; Berschin, *Biographie*, pp. 158-60. Cf. the unilluminating comments of Balzani, *Cronache*, pp. 95-7.

⁹⁷D. Mallardo, 'Giovanni Diacono Napoletano: la Continuazione del «Liber Pontificalis»', *RSCI* 4 (1950), pp. 325-58, at 353-4.

⁹⁸Mallardo, 'Giovanni Diacono', pp. 355-8 for a detailed consideration of the slight alterations to the *LP*'s account. Cf. *LP* II, p. 4.

⁹⁹*GEN*, p. 428, c. 48, ll. 3-5: *hic [Leo] fugiens ad Carolum regem, spopondit ei, ut, si de suis illum defenderet inimicis, [sic] augustali eum diademate coronaret*. Mallardo, 'Giovanni Diacono Napoletano', p. 357, regards this deal as a criticism of the pope although it seems to me to be cast in neutral terms. Mallardo's ref to G. Waitz, *Deutsche Verfassungsgeschichte*, vol. III, pp. 376f (and esp. 380f) is inappropriate; Waitz discusses the relationship generally rather than the *GEN*'s account specifically.

¹⁰⁰Mallardo, 'Giovanni Diacono', p. 357, also noting the similarity to the account of this event in the *Annales Laureshamenses*.

¹⁰¹*GEN*, p. 428, c. 48, ll. 5-6: *Carolus autem optatum audiens promissionem, e vestigio cum magno apparatu hostium profisciens, urbemque capiens, illum [Leo] in suam revocavit sedem. At ille statim Carolum coronavit et dignam ultionem in suos exercuit inimicos*.

¹⁰²*GEN*, p. 428, c. 49, ll. 8-12.

Lothar I's direct dealings with Naples are known principally from a reference in the capitulary of 846 to Sergius duke of Naples as *magister militum*¹⁰³ and a much less-discussed passage in the *GEN*.¹⁰⁴ Sometime c. 838, and certainly 835-9, duke Andreas of Naples sent a request to Lothar for help against the aggressive Sicard of Benevento. Lothar sent *Contardus* [Conrad ?] *fidelis suum*, to inform Sicard *ut, si nollet cessare persequi Parthenopensem populum, vesanum eius furorem ipse medicaretur*. On his arrival Contardus discovered that Sicard had just been killed by the Beneventans. He was on the point of returning *ad suum seniore* when prevailed upon by Andreas to marry the duke's daughter, Eupraxia, who had been married to Leo, the son of the previous duke, Bonus.¹⁰⁵ This would have thus tied Contardus into two of the major Neapolitan families. He consented but then became sucked into local politics. He conspired with Andreas's enemies and killed the duke. Three days later he, his wife and supporters were massacred by the Neapolitans in revenge. It is hard to be certain but it seems unlikely that this was a specifically anti-Frankish or anti-Carolingian reaction. Contardus's death resulted from his involvement with bloody Neapolitan politics. The eventual successor as duke, Sergius, pursued a similar policy of closeness to Lothar.¹⁰⁶ The *GEN*'s concluding comment about this episode suggests Sergius may have been linked to Contardus because after hearing that Lothar's ambassador had been killed Sergius withdrew to his *castrum* at Cuma, where a little later he was declared *magister militum*.¹⁰⁷

The specifics of this passage are somewhat opaque. Generally Contardus's killing has been understood as resistance to an attempt to make himself duke.¹⁰⁸ The focus of the *GEN*'s report is the the actions of Lothar's *fidelis*. Certainly the Carolingians are distant

¹⁰³MGH Cap. I, no. 203.

¹⁰⁴*GEN*, pp. 431-2, c. 57.

¹⁰⁵On Bonus: Bertolini, 'Bono', *DBI* 12, (1970), pp. 266-8.

¹⁰⁶M. Fuiano, *La Cultura a Napoli nell'Alto Medioevo*, (Naples, Milan, 1961) p. 141; Cassandro, 'Il Ducato Bizantino', *SNapoli* II.1, p. 76.

¹⁰⁷*GEN*, p. 431, ll. 43-5.

¹⁰⁸Gay, *L'Italie Meridionale*, pp. 20-1.

even here. Lothar is referred to rather vaguely simply as *dommus* [sic] or *senior*.¹⁰⁹ It seems unlikely he can have been much more than a name to John the Deacon. Later, in a reference which introduces Louis II to the narrative, the *GEN* tells us the relationship between Lothar and Sergius bore fruit. Sergius and the 'prince of the Lombards' sent to Lothar for his son Louis II, *bonae adolescentiae iuvenem*, to come and deal with the Arabs who were enjoying major success in Calabria. *Qui adveniens caelesti comitatus auxilio, ex illis Hismahelitis triumphavit*. Then having *sagaciter ordinans divisionem Beneventani et Salernitani principum, victor reversus est*.¹¹⁰ The language used about Louis is again resolutely positive, indeed even more so than the *CSBC*: he is a good young man, he is divinely aided, and he wisely orders the division of Benevento. It is striking that the *GEN* passes over the *divisio* so casually, almost taking for granted this demonstration of Louis's power.

This passage precedes the far longer and more directly important episodes concern Louis II. Louis established a close working relationship with several southern ecclesiastics including Landolf of Capua and Athanasius I of Naples,¹¹¹ a son of duke Sergius. Athanasius's brother Gregory succeeded as duke. In terms reminiscent of the *CSBC* the *GEN* describes the ferocity of the Saracen attacks and how Louis, moved by the invitation 'by the Lombards' (not it will be noted, the Neapolitans) to come to their 'liberation' brought his army.¹¹² Louis's justification was theological, for why else had 'Christ descended from the Father and suffered physical death, if not to free them from the oppression of the most pagan yoke' ?¹¹³ There is perhaps an echo here of Erchempert, the *CSBC* and the Louis II *rythmus*, all of which include Christological references.¹¹⁴

¹⁰⁹*GEN*, p. 431, ll. 26 & 30.

¹¹⁰*GEN*, p. 433, c. 61, ll. 21-5.

¹¹¹Fuiano, *Cultura*, p. 142; and above *Vita Athanasii*, pp. 444-9.

¹¹²*GEN*, c. 64, p. 434, ll. 39-41: *...Saracenorum ferocitas ita in his praevaluit regionibus, ut multarum urbium atque castrorum cotidianum fieret excidium*.

¹¹³*GEN*, c. 64, p. 434, ll. 41-4: *Idcirco Lhodoguicos imperator supplicatione commotus Langobardorum, ad eorum liberationem validum movit exercitum, asserens se rationem redditurum, si, pro quibus Christus descendit de sinu Patris subiens corpoream mortem, non eos a paganissimo iugo liberaret oppressos*.

¹¹⁴See below pp. 116-17.

The emperor entered every city except Naples thanks to the *familiaritas* of Athanasius with the emperor. Louis's entry into the cities of the south appears to have been thought to possess high significance: it would have constituted being brought *ab eius potestate*.¹¹⁵ In Athanasius's *vita* Sergius I is also referred to as *familiarissimus* with Lothar and Louis¹¹⁶ so it is possible this was considered a family trait. More precisely, it may well be associated with the 'good' members of the family; the attempt of Athanasius's nephew, Sergius II, to turn out the bishop [below] is strongly disapproved of by both texts.¹¹⁷ Sergius was not 'familiar', in either sense. Louis completed the campaign by capturing Benevento (a 'victory accepted from the heavens') and with it the famous Saracen leader, Seodan, who had occupied the city.¹¹⁸

Louis's last intervention involved protecting Athanasius from duke Sergius II. Sergius II confiscated all the property from his family, including the bishop. Athanasius sent his *apocrisiarius* to Louis at Benevento, who in turn sent Marinus of Amalfi (a detail from the *Vita Athanasii* perhaps)¹¹⁹ to conduct the bishop to safety in Sorrento whose bishop, Stephen, was another of Athanasius's brothers.¹²⁰ Subsequently the *GEN* ironically records the revolt in 871 by the Beneventans and the Salernitans (note, those earlier 'wisely organized' by the younger Louis)¹²¹ who *aemulatores tanti bonitatis praedicti imperatoris insurrexerunt cum consilio Sergi ducis contra eum*.¹²² This undoubtedly also reiterated the text's hostility to Sergius. The imprisonment of Louis 'with his wife', caused the Franks

¹¹⁵*GEN*, c. 64, p. 435, ll. 1-3.: *Solummodo Neapolitanam non est ingressus civitatem, quia tamen iste domnus Athanasius familiaritatem apud eum obtinuit, ut saltem in modico non amaricaretur ab eius potestate*. Cf Fuiano, *Cultura*, p. 142.

¹¹⁶*Vita S. Athanasii*, ed. Waitz, *MGH SS RL*, c.2, p. 441, ll. 26-31; Cassandro, 'Ducato', *SNapoli* I, i, p.68.

¹¹⁷Cf. Mallardo, 'Giovanni Diacono', pp. 328-9 who hypothesizes that John did not write a later continuation of the *GEN* to include Athanasius II because of the hostility of the new bishop Stephen..

¹¹⁸*GEN*, c. 64, p. 435, ll. 3-5. *Beneventi itaque commorans, magnam de caelo accepit victoriam, ita enim ut, Agarenis fame et gladio interemptis et rege eorum Seudan capto, civitates, quas coeperant, auferret et in pristinum revocaret dominium*.

¹¹⁹Cf. *Vita Athanasii*, p. 446, ll. 34.

¹²⁰*GEN*, p. 435, c. 65, ll. 6-27.

¹²¹*GEN*, p. 433, c. 61, ll. 21-5; cf. p. 116 above.

¹²²*GEN*, p. 435, c. 61, ll. 27-9.

to go back *in regionem suam* [sic].¹²³ The text's negative opinion of the events of 871 is further emphasized when it notes that Louis's release by the Beneventans was on condition of his giving an oath *quod nullatenus pro tanta inhumanitate, quam ei ingesserant, redderet eis meritum*.¹²⁴ Subsequently the Salernitans suffered further Saracen attacks and so Athanasius went to intervene with Louis in Ravenna, via the pope in Rome. The bishop gave many gifts and asked Louis to consider the judgement of God when each would be received according to his own actions; the emperor, again *commotus* by the plight of the southerners (perhaps as he had been when they had first appealed to him) sent forces to the south who won an unspecified, but yet again 'heaven-sent', victory.¹²⁵ This renewed intervention for the good of his flock was Athanasius's last public act. Soon after he died.

Berschin claims the *GEN* has wider horizons than many other texts, taking in Byzantium, the Franks, Sicily and Rome.¹²⁶ This is true up to a point, but like Agnellus, its focus remains resolutely local. The wider view is I suspect largely because Naples's geo-political position brought it into contact with these other territories, unlike the 'backwater' Ravenna.¹²⁷ This aside *GEN*'s 'wider horizons' may be something of an illusion. Unsurprisingly in episcopal *gesta*, as in the *vita Athanasii* above, the focus is upon the bishop. The entire account of Louis's activities with regard to Naples hinges upon his personal relationship with Athanasius. The real moral of the story is that Athanasius was a fine bishop who always sought to serve the best interests of his see even when his own circumstances were troubled. Louis's role is as a kind of *deus ex machina* who could be prevailed upon to protect Athanasius himself or his region. Just like the *CSBC*, in which the abbots of Montecassino play the pivotal role by bringing Louis to the south and supporting him, in the *GEN* it is the local ecclesiastical leader, not Louis, who stands at the heart of the account. However although both abbot and bishop are important in the

¹²³*GEN*, p. 435, c. 65, l. 30.

¹²⁴*GEN*, p. 435, c. 65, ll. 31-3.

¹²⁵*GEN*, p. 435, c. 65, ll. 27-41.

¹²⁶Berschin, *Biographie*, p. 168. This opinion has been expressed before cf. Balzani, *Cronache*, pp. 96-7.

¹²⁷Thus Brown, 'Interplay', p. 155. On Naples's wide links: Cilento, *SNapoli II i passim*.

text because of their office, their political actions derive importance by association with Louis II; the churchmen's appeals depend on a tacit acknowledgement of Louis's power. Thus, although our sources are local, it is not the local ecclesiastics power or attributes which prove decisive but those of Louis. It is the relationship with him which is supposed to impress - witness Athanasius's *familiaritas* with a great ruler. This textual background is the most pervasive aspect of the image of the Carolingians in southern Italy. They are constantly visible in the subtext as 'over-rulers'. This is most important precisely because it is simply assumed by contemporary writers. It is probably most clearly signalled by the event generally thought of as the terminal disaster of Carolingian power in the south - the imprisonment of Louis II in 871. Such an action would only have been undertaken if Louis II was deeply feared. Evidently this view of Louis II went well beyond our texts. Although it's an obvious point to make, the major element of representations of the Carolingians in southern sources is their power.

Concluding Comments: In the previous two chapters I have attempted to group the texts as either northern or southern. This is undoubtedly an unsatisfactory categorization from some perspectives: Agnellus's work for example may have been a northern text geographically but its merely glancing references to the Carolingians make it far more similar to southern works such as the *GEN*. The purpose of what follows is therefore to consider alternative categorizations and the similarities and differences between the texts with regard to the Carolingians.

The scarcity of historical writing from ninth-century Italy has been a repeated lament of commentators. The limited sample which does survive has certain common features. Most of these historical works can be roughly grouped as either local history (whether of a see, monastery or region) or general histories. Of the latter type only three examples survive (Andreas, the *HLCG* and the *CB*) and they have been much-criticized. Perhaps significantly they are all from northern Italy. (The exact place of the *libellus* in this scheme is harder to determine because it is such an unusual text.) But what these northern texts do

reveal is that as soon as an author attempted to write a history of the *regnum italiae* it inevitably took the Carolingians as its central topic. This is clearest in Andreas of Bergamo's work. Wickham's stricture that Andreas has no Italian events in his text between 833-63 is also an acknowledgement that the history of the *regnum italiae* had come to be indivisible from that of the Carolingian family, was indeed subsumed by it. The lack of detail in some of these works is not to be contrasted, as Wickham does, with the efficacy of Carolingian government in Italy, but rather as an expression of Carolingian importance. North Italian history, at least, was coterminous with Carolingian history. In this sense these authors' emphasis on the imperial dynasty reflects an awareness that Italian history was determined elsewhere. This is not to claim any special literary or historical merit for the three northern texts. In truth they are slight by comparison with west Frankish ones. But, albeit lacking in detail, they demonstrate that some at least in the Carolingian territories in Italy were well-aware of the importance of their rulers and the role they had played in shaping Italian history.

The modern historiography concerning ninth-century Italian historical texts has passed through two phases: firstly, value-judgements, in which the texts were severely criticized for various perceived failings¹²⁸ - the barbarity of their Latin, the paucity of hard historical data, the narrowness of their outlook and the general impoverishment of their historical understanding - have given way more recently to more sympathetic approaches. Wickham and Capo have used these texts to elucidate concepts of identity, the former in terms of 'social memory', the latter in terms of Lombard ethnic identity and its relationship to political independence, particularly for Benevento. In very different ways both Wickham (inspired by R. H. C. Davis)¹²⁹ and Capo have adopted an approach to early medieval historical writing couched entirely in terms of the contemporary effect the works produced. In their views historical writing was never just about recording the past but

¹²⁸E.g. Balzani, *Cronache*, p. 91: 'la cronografia Italiana entra adesso nel periodo più povero della sua vita'.

¹²⁹Wickham, 'Lawyer's Time', pp. 53-4; R. H. C. Davis, *The Normans and their Myth*, (London, 1976).

rather about structuring it for the present. This effect, the purpose, so to speak, of writing history, means that even if these historical texts were not consciously conceived to fulfill this objective they would nevertheless illuminate it.

For Wickham the absence of any substantial concept of the state or the kingdom indicates the weak hold such an idea had on northern Italy.¹³⁰ The creation of regional or local histories followed from this and the dissolution of the north Italian state c. 900 is prefigured in this cultural weakness. Wickham does not discuss texts earlier than Andreas of Bergamo nor is his study concerned with the south, so most of the works considered above do not feature. Andreas is of course only one author. Extrapolating from his work alone is delicate. One might question whether Andreas can be made to stand for the politico-historical culture of the whole *regnum italiae* at the end of the Carolingian period, although of course we have little alternative. But Wickham then runs through the main events of Andreas's account concerning the Carolingians and concludes: 'this certainly shows how little impact the Carolingians made on Italian historical consciousness, at least up until Louis II...historical memory focussed on but one or two events of dynastic history as the only thing it was relevant to remember...Andreas's dynastic anecdotes are without a context to give them meaning such as might have been provided by the collective memory of his own family, or by a sense of the history of the Italian court or of the Italian state. These were evidently unavailable.'¹³¹ However those 'one or two events of dynastic history' were 'relevant' because they explain how the kingdom became what it then was. They are not to be counterpointed against the 'real' history of the *regnum italiae*; for Andreas they *are* the history of the *regnum italiae* - that's precisely why they were remembered. Andreas believed that the fortunes of the Italian kingdom were largely determined by dynastic machinations which is why he recorded them. As I argued above his conception of history is built around the deeds of monarchs. This is not to claim that

¹³⁰Wickham, 'Lawyer's Time', pp. 57-8: 'it is above all the absence of any sense of the structure of the Italian state, and the continuity of the Italian court, that I will wish to emphasize'.

¹³¹Wickham, 'Lawyer's Time', p. 57.

Andreas's historical method is flawless but there is nothing wrong with his historical consciousness.

Moreover, most of the extant historical texts survive in later copies. Historical writing from northern Italy in this period is incredibly scanty and one notes, both the major north Italian historical texts have survived outside Italian libraries in later German copies: Andreas's history survives in two St. Gall manuscripts, the better of which is a twelfth century copy,¹³² the *HLCG* in a tenth-century manuscript probably from Mainz.¹³³ Only the *CB* survives in a manuscript in an Italian library (and even this has Irish associations).¹³⁴ Furthermore one might question whether the *CB* or the *HLCG* are really attempts to write 'History'. Both these latter texts travelled as parts of, respectively, a legal compilation and a *computus* manuscript. They were not copied because of their historical value. One possibility (which is something of a variant on Wickham's thesis) is that we know only of those north Italian texts copied by German scribes because in Italy the end of the *regnum italiae* likewise terminated Italian interest in the period: later Italian scribes simply didn't copy historical texts about the Carolingians. The same was nearly true for the southern sources: the *GEN* and *vita Athanasii* are both preserved in the same single manuscript;¹³⁵ Erchempert and several important later texts (such as the *Chronicon Salernitanum*) survive together in another single thirteenth-century manuscript;¹³⁶ the *CSBC* likewise survives in a single exemplar.¹³⁷ Without the interest of the thirteenth century compiler our southern sources would be as meagre as those from the north. This

¹³²Bethmann, 'Geschichtschreibung', p. 368; St. Gall Stiftsbibliothek, cod. 620 the twelfth century manuscript contains an edited version of Paul the Deacon's *Historia Langobardorum* down to fol. 255, and Andreas's work on fol. 255-72; see *Verzeichnis der Handschriften der Stiftsbibliothek von St. Gallen...* ed. (1875), pp. 201-2. This manuscript contains hagiographical and historical works such as the *Vita S. Findani* and Cassiodorus's *sentari de anima*; cf. Pertz, *MGH SS III*, p. 231.

¹³³Mordek, *Bibliotheca*, pp. 131-49; above ch. II pp. 55-7.

¹³⁴D. McCarthy & D. O. Cróinín, 'The "Lost" Irish 84-Year Easter Table Rediscovered', *Peritia* 6-7 (1987-88), pp. 227-42.

¹³⁵Vat. Lat. 5007; P. Bertolini, 'La Serie Episcopale Napoletane nei secc. VIII e IX. Ricerche sulle Fonti per la Storia d'Italia Meridionale', *RSCI* 24 (1970), pp. 349-440, has a full discussion in the notes to 352-4, with refs.

¹³⁶Vat. Lat. 5001; Cilento, 'Marino Freccia', pp. 300-3.

¹³⁷Pratesi, 'Chronica', p. 332f.

is of course to accept part of Wickham's argument: contemporary concerns did affect the preservation of historical material. However it does not prove that the decline of the idea of the *regnum italiae* or the importance of the Carolingians had already occurred by c. 900. Andreas's account deals with little except the Carolingians.

Capo's approach is different and proceeds from the assumption that the 'Lombard' texts (Andreas, Erchempert, the *CSBC*, the *Chronicon Salernitanum* and others) can be considered as a group because they express varieties of Lombard identity. She argues that, after the Lombard kingdom fell in 774, these texts were a way for the Lombards to work out the contradictions inherent in being a people (*gens*) without political independence. This contradiction furnished the polemic of her title - how to justify or assert the continuing identity of the *gens Langobardorum* when it no longer possessed that political independence Capo clearly considers the *sine qua non* of ethnic identity. This polemic was worked out in her view via accounts of the conquest of the Lombard kingdom. Indeed Capo hypothesizes that this Lombard identity was so strong our texts reveal only a fragment of a much more general discussion amongst the 'strati del popolo privi di testimonianza scritta'.¹³⁸ Her analysis is interesting but in my opinion misses some crucial points. Underlying Capo's approach is Bethmann's 1864 definition of a whole tranche of sources as 'Lombard', but this list hardly bears close inspection: Agnellus of Ravenna is certainly not a Lombard historian, nor is the *GEN* a Lombard text. In fact Bethmann appears to have considered almost all Italian texts of the eighth and ninth centuries 'Lombard'.¹³⁹ Capo to be fair uses only those texts indicated above with a realistic claim to be considered 'Lombard'. However her use of the concept of Lombard identity fails to take account of the different expressions of that identity in the sources (acknowledged by Capo but not integrated into her analysis): Erchempert's definition of Lombardness is very different from Paul the Deacon's; likewise as I have tried to suggest Andreas's epitome of

¹³⁸Capo, 'Polemica', *passim*, esp. pp. 5-11, 14-24; quotation from p. 9.

¹³⁹Bethmann, 'Geschichtsschreibung', pp. 335-414, at 367-375.

Paul the Deacon's *Historia Langobardorum* expresses a radically different version of 'Lombard' history from that of the original text. Indeed one might go further in critiquing the 'Lombard' sources. Andreas hardly expresses any definition of 'Lombardness' at all. After 774 he includes only very few reference to the Lombards; that they suffered *multa fatigatio* from the Slavs, (which can hardly refer to anywhere except Friuli), that they participated in the campaigns in the south.¹⁴⁰ Indeed one might even point out that in point of fact Andreas never describes himself as a Lombard, does not have a Lombard name, says little about the Lombards after 774 and understands 'their' history almost exclusively in terms of the history of their rulers. Similarly the *HLCG* is concerned not to defend a definition of Lombard identity but to describe and justify the transition from one legal tradition, the Lombard one, to another, that of the Carolingians. In fact within the *regnum italiae* evidence of Lombard identity is almost undetectable. Even in the south some of the texts Capo considers can hardly be described as Lombard 'nationalist'. The *supputatio* is strongly pro-Frankish; if anything it presents the Lombards as responsible for the crisis of Arab attacks.

If the Lombard character of many of these works has been overplayed they nevertheless have other interesting aspects, however. Except for the *HLCG* and Agnellus, all these works were written in the last third of the ninth century so our picture is inevitably biased towards a 'mature' image of the Carolingians from the last years of Carolingian power. Conversely, however at least we know that the representations preserved in these sources were by contemporaries. (This is the main purpose for limiting the selection of texts to those produced within living memory of 875.) Furthermore many of the authors had actually come into close personal contact with the Carolingians: Agnellus participated in the baptism of Lothar I's daughter,¹⁴¹ the author of the *supputatio* was alive during abbot Bassacius's time and was probably an eyewitness of the imperial couple's visit to

¹⁴⁰ Andreas, pp. 226, ll. 35-7; 227, l. 16.

¹⁴¹ Above, ch. II, pp. 47f.

Montecassino,¹⁴² Andreas participated in the transfer of Louis II's body.¹⁴³ Even Erchempert, though not personally involved with the Carolingians, had moved in the same elevated circles: as Montecassino's ambassador he visited both the duke of Naples and the pope.¹⁴⁴ Our named authors were therefore amongst the political elite. In many regards this is all to the good. Carolingian propaganda must have been aimed predominantly at this political elite. However none of our authors were the very highest kind office-holder, *primates* who might be the abbots of major monasteries, bishops or *missi*. They belonged to the political group at one remove, at least, from the greatest of the Italian elite. Agnellus, probably the most senior of our authors ranked himself tenth in Ravenna's ecclesiastical hierarchy c. 830;¹⁴⁵ Andreas of Bergamo was a cleric,¹⁴⁶ Erchempert just a monk,¹⁴⁷ although obviously one well-respected amongst the Montecassino community.

Unsurprisingly our named authors, Agnellus, Andreas, Erchempert, the John the Deacon who wrote the *GEN*, were all ecclesiastics; indeed except Andreas all were monks. We can reasonably assume that the anonymous authors of the other texts were churchmen too and that the writer of the *CSBC* was probably a monk from Montecassino. We can thus see at least how the middling ecclesiastical elite liked to portray its relations with the Carolingians. All the texts have a tendency to represent ecclesiastics influencing the Carolingians: Andreas's account of archbishop Angilbert of Milan persuading Louis the Pious to be merciful to Lothar I; the *libellus's* description of John of Ravenna as *familiar* with the emperor and the repeated descriptions in the *CSBC* and Erchempert of the interventions by the abbots of Montecassino and bishop Landolf of Capua to persuade Louis II to come to the south, which are similar to those in the *Vita Athanasii* and the *GEN* concerning the bishop of Naples' influence. Quite apart from Carolingian propaganda

¹⁴²*CSBC*, c. 12, p. 474, l. 35; Cilento, 'La Cronaca dei Conti e dei Principi Longobardi di Capua dei Codici Casinese 175 e Cavense 4 (815-1000)', *BISI* 69 (1957), pp. 1-66 at 6 n. 1.

¹⁴³Above ch. II, p. 65.

¹⁴⁴Oldoni, 'Erchemperto', p. 67.

¹⁴⁵Agnellus, p. 333, c. 83, ll. 6-8.

¹⁴⁶Bertolini, 'Andrea', pp. 79-80.

¹⁴⁷Above ch. III, pp. 98-9 n. 28 for the debate on his monastic status.

these texts obviously include representations of local figures too. Distinguishing the local representations from the Carolingian material is very difficult.

However we can perhaps find traces of such Carolingian propaganda. Louis II's southern campaigns were obviously the source of much interest, especially in the south itself, although judging from Andreas and the *CB*'s account certainly not exclusively so. The *CSBC*, *GEN* and Erchempert are all fairly consistent about Louis II. He is well thought of although for different reasons. He is credited by the *CSBC* and *GEN* with saving the south from Arab conquest and is described by all three texts as either the *liberator*¹⁴⁸ or *salvator Beneventanae provinciae*.¹⁴⁹ He is attributed moral as well as military qualities and Erchempert even goes so far as to call him *vir sanctissimus*¹⁵⁰ - although Erchempert also gives Arichis this epithet.¹⁵¹ Moreover all the texts not only echo each other in the account of his imprisonment but also echo the version of events offered in the Louis II *rythmus*, a poem probably from north ^{Italy},¹⁵² by condemning Adelchis's conspiracy. Andreas and the *GEN* both comment with bitter irony on how the Beneventans returned evil for the good Louis had given them.¹⁵³ There are indications that it was not only the narratives which presented this Christian image of Louis's activities. This image, although it was hardly unusual in the early medieval period, may have formed part of a propaganda offensive across all available media: for example, the only set of early medieval *laudes regiae* which refer to the *exercitus Christianorum* are those of Louis II recorded in a Chieti manuscript.¹⁵⁴

¹⁴⁸*Vita Athanasii*, p. 448, ll. 2-3.

¹⁴⁹Erchempert, p. 247, ll. 25-6 *sanctissimum virum, salvatorem Beneventanae provinciae*.

¹⁵⁰*Ibid*; cf Löwe, 'Grenzen', p. 356.

¹⁵¹Erchempert, p. 235, c.2.

¹⁵²See below ch. IV, pp. 153f..

¹⁵³Above ch. II, p. 71 & n. 193; ch. III, p. 117.

¹⁵⁴B. Opfermann, *Die liturgischen Herrscherakklamationen im Sacrum Imperium des Mittelalters*, (Weimar, 1953), pp. 104-5; E. Kantorowicz, *Laudes Regiae. A Study in Liturgical Acclamations and Medieval Ruler Worship*, (Los Angeles, 1946) p. 86. Other early medieval *laudes regiae* referred to the army by ethnic appellation: *exercitus Francorum/Romanorum/Alemannorum*; cf. texts in Opfermann, pp. 104f.

If such textual parallels do cross the boundaries between the works one can consider whether the composition of the texts can be linked too. As mentioned above, Louis II's activities against the Arabs are very fully-recorded by the late ninth century chroniclers. Perhaps his campaigns spurred the writing of history in the first place. In the case of Erchempert and the *GEN* this can probably be discounted - the texts are too late. But the *supputatio* may well have been written as a result of what appeared at the time to be a decisive set of victories in 866-7. The *supputatio*'s later manuscript association with a catalogue-annal about the princes of Capua places it codicologically in a political/historical context, but the rest of the contents of the manuscript are liturgical and have been seen as a monument to Casinese traditions.¹⁵⁵ This may explain why the *supputatio* was copied forty years after its composition but not why it was originally written. Given the content of the text Louis's campaigns in the late 860s seem to be the only possible explanation for the creation of the work. The types of historical writing used by our authors is also striking. None of these works are annals, indeed, more than this, almost no annals of any kind survive from early medieval Italy, if they ever existed, much less anything comparable to the *ARF* or its descendants. Italian court circles do not seem to have felt the need to produce history like the Franks or, later, West Saxons at Alfred's court. When Italian authors wrote history they strove to create continuous narratives, not to maintain a running commentary.

The above discussion allows us to identify the environment in which at least some of the texts were written and some of the ways their authors approached the writing of history. The obvious but much more difficult next step would be to consider their audience. I have grave misgivings about even attempting to reconstruct the works' audiences from their structure or concerns. However, for some of these works it seems fairly clear: there is a scholarly consensus that Agnellus was probably writing for the

¹⁵⁵Pratesi, 'Cronaca', pp. 343-4. On the Capuan princely catalogue-annal: Cilento, 'Cronaca', *passim*.

Ravenna clergy;¹⁵⁶ likewise one presumes that the *GEN* and probably the *Vita Athanasii* were written for a Neapolitan audience, perhaps again the city's clergy specifically. If our aim is to understand the political impact of these works then three texts are of little use since they can only be approached from a different perspective: it is clear that the codicology and concerns of the *HLCG* imply a legal audience; the same is probably true for the *Libellus*. Likewise the *CB*, probably written at Leno south of Brescia, again probably has a monastic origin, but since it survives as part of a computus manuscript, it must, even more specifically, have reached a computistical audience. Quite what ^{one} means by 'legal' or 'computistical' audiences is however a more difficult problem to which I have no solution. Both the *supputatio* and Erchempert come from Montecassino (although note that in Erchempert's case this means the institution rather than the place, since he wrote after the monastery's destruction and the monks' transfer to Teano or Capua). Presumably therefore these two works were intended for the monks of Montecassino yet this does not explain the historiographical schemes adopted by the two Cassinese writers. It is only chance that we can identify 'their' audience from codicology and the texts themselves. The most important and opaque of our texts is Andreas of Bergamo's work. The only surviving manuscripts are in St. Gall, supposedly by local scribes. There is no direct evidence where Andreas composed the work. It *might* have been written in St. Gall;¹⁵⁷ there is no trace of it in Bergamo. It is difficult to see why it would have been of much interest except in a general historical sense. Furthermore if it was designed for St. Gall monks I can see no relationship between the historiographical model Andreas adopted (a monarchical version of Paul the Deacon's *Historia Langobardorum*) and its 'audience'. Thus relating the character of the audience with the nature of the text is difficult. When one considers that the same problems exist with the securely attributed Montecassino texts I hope the reasons for my caution become clear. Below I go on to suggest that our texts may have been

¹⁵⁶See ch. II, pp. 36-7.

¹⁵⁷I am grateful to Ross Balzaretti for discussion of this point.

intended for local audiences. However reconstructing the composition of such audiences on the basis of the nature of the works themselves cannot be undertaken safely. We cannot use these works as a kind of historical sonar to sound out textual audiences on the basis of their 'echo'. The only certainty is that these texts contained representations of the Carolingians which were available at a local level. As I hope to show below this is not a negligible point. However we must seek to limit our considerations to the representations the texts contain rather than try to hypothesize about their audience.

What of the broader significance of these conclusions ? It might be suggested that by concentrating on the role of the Carolingians in these texts I exaggerate their importance. This is a risk. However many Italian historical works have a narrow field of vision and deal with the Carolingians only when they cross it. Agnellus of Ravenna for example includes information about the Carolingians only when germane to his history of the archbishopric. To read him, conclude that he says little about Charlemagne's dynasty and therefore draw the conclusion that that dynasty was not important to ninth century 'Italians' is inappropriate. Agnellus wrote about the archbishops of Ravenna, just as Erchempert, say, wrote about the southern Lombards. The Carolingian dynasty's field of operation was not the local one, however, but, for want of a better word, the 'national' one. Andreas's text shows that this 'national' arena could be reflected in a conception of history (and politics) that was not merely ethnic or narrowly-focused on the concerns of one place or institution, and which emphasized the importance of the Carolingian dynasty and its achievements in Italy. Conversely this is not to deny the value of the regional sources. In fact we can use these different concepts of historical writing contrapuntally. 'Nationwide' politics must have been composed ultimately of a mosaic of local actions. The perceptions of the locally-biased writers above are the very stuff of Carolingian ideological activity. In justifying themselves to local audiences the Carolingians laid the foundations for local obedience and ultimately the efficacy of the state. The absence of 'official' annals like the *ARF* hampers historians in some respects but prevents us losing

sight of the importance of local audiences. Moreover even local sources sometimes report distant Carolingian 'imperial' history, albeit sometimes garbled: Agnellus, Erchempert and Andreas all refer to the results of the fraternal war in 841;¹⁵⁸ the *GEN* and the *libellus* describe the imperial coronation in 800; one can extrapolate that Agnellus knew of it too since he refers to Lothar as *augustus*.¹⁵⁹ However narrow the focus of these works, implicitly just outside the text Carolingian power provided their framework. When, for example, Agnellus recounts the wars between the Carolingians and links this development to Arab attacks on the Adriatic coast he is tacitly acknowledging that the local community which is the focus of his historical work is part of the Carolingian world and is affected by its vicissitudes. That Italian ninth century texts tend to adopt local views does not mean their authors were unaware of the wider world and their communities' place in it. Such perceptions of Carolingian power, however unsophisticated they may be, underlay the consent of local elites. These narratives show the public face of the Carolingians at ground level, show indeed some of the unthinking assumptions about the Carolingians which only became visible when placed under strain.

This poses a particularly tricky problem in the terms of this thesis: the reports about the Carolingians offered by our sources are *both representations and perceptions*. They tell us about the perceptions of the Carolingians by individual authors but they are at the same time themselves representations of the Carolingians. The theoretically-straightforward dichotomy between perception and representation collapses. The issue is even more complicated because these are not 'official' images propagated by the Carolingian regime itself; although, as I have tried to argue above, at times one can discern that the representations of the Carolingians by these authors were influenced by such 'official' images. Nevertheless essentially the narrative sources are reactions to those official images rather than reproductions of them. In some regards this makes them even more useful as a

¹⁵⁸Agnellus's prophecy, pp. 384-6, c. 166 & ch. II, pp. 51f; Andreas, p. 226; Erchempert, p. 239, c. 11 & ch. III, p. 104.

¹⁵⁹Agnellus, p. 352, c. 113, ll. 26-7.

way of examining the impact of Carolingian propaganda at grass-roots level because they show something not only of what the Carolingians wanted to project but also of how that projection was received. Some of the topoi of these works indicate the key actions by which the Carolingians built such images: mediation between local *potentes*, whether bishops, abbots, counts or princes; campaigning, especially with a religious justification against the Arabs; following on from this conspicuous acts of piety; and the patronage of learning. One should be a little careful. It is possible that genre played an important role in deciding the literary themes of the texts. It is striking for example that the only works to emphasize the parallels between the Carolingian emperors and the ancient Roman ones are the *libellus* and the *HLCG* - both of whose narratives centre strongly on legal matters. However this is probably reassuring. Only when a text has a very obvious slant is its representation of the Carolingians affected. By-and-large our texts have no vested interest in particularly hymning or hating the Carolingians. We can therefore assume that, making allowance for the imperfection of any mediated experience, what we get is pretty much what our authors saw. The regionalized historiography of Italy sometimes seem to almost omit the Carolingians entirely. The evidence above suggests on the contrary that the Carolingians had a high-profile throughout Italy.

IV

The Carolingians and Literary Productions in Italy

Having dealt with narrative sources in chapters II and III, in this chapter I will turn to other literary representations of the Carolingians. Recent research, particularly by English-language scholars,¹ has further emphasized the importance of the patronage of scholarly pursuits as a key aspect of Carolingian propaganda and self-image. Indeed it is, along with the political success of the empire, the key element of Carolingian *renovatio*. Without the revival in learning the phrase 'Carolingian Renaissance' has little meaning and the revival around Charlemagne's court has been the subject of a voluminous literature.² However, although the material from Carolingian Italy has been often referred to and has been repeatedly analysed [see below], it has consistently disappointed. Despite the substantial administrative continuity across 774³ and the incorporation of aspects of Lombard kingship in the Carolingian era and the evidence for Lombard patronage,⁴ no coherent corpus of written material survives from Carolingian Italy, much less from the court itself. In part this reflects the absence at the Italian court of any major intellectual, such as Alcuin or Hincmar. (Those present in Pavia like Dungal or Anastasius had made their reputations elsewhere.) This absence has been commented on (at least as regards historical writing⁵) although no consideration has been given to its cause. One can only glean fragments from other sources. I have sought to contextualize each work as closely as possible.

¹P. Godman 'Louis the Pious and his Poets', *FS* 19 (1985), pp. 239-89; R. McKitterick, 'Royal Patronage of Culture in the Frankish Kingdoms under the Carolingians: Motives and Consequences', *Committenti e Produzione Artistico-Letteraria nell'alto Medioevo Occidentale*, (SSpol XXXIX, 1991), pp. 92-129.

²From the enormous literature I would cite only: Bullough, *Age of Charlemagne*, (London, 1965); H. Fichtenau, *The Carolingian Empire*, trans. P. Munz (Toronto, 1991); Godman, *Poets and Emperors*, (Oxford, 1987).

³C. Wickham, *Early Medieval Italy*, pp. 48-53.

⁴Most recently, conveniently and somewhat polemically summarized by J. Mitchell, 'The Display of Script and the Uses of Painting in Longobard Italy', *Testo e Immagine nell'Alto Medioevo*, tom. 2, (SSpoleto XLII, 1994), pp. 887-951.

⁵Wickham, 'Lawyer's Time', p. 56.

There are some limits on the material considered below. Although letters can probably be considered a category of literary production I have excluded them, partly because they are so numerous they would require a whole chapter to themselves, partly because the methodological demands of analyzing them are somewhat different from those for other sources considered below and partly because for completeness their inclusion would require a reconsideration of the whole *Codex Carolinus* and, as indicated earlier, Franko-Papal relations is so large a subject that I have been unable to deal with it in this thesis. Further, because my interest is primarily in those works which might have influenced the image of the *regnum Italiae*, I have also excluded those productions which make reference to the Carolingians in Italy but were apparently known by neither the Carolingian rulers of Italy themselves nor by their subjects; hence these productions could have no effect upon either Italy's rulers or ruled. I hope to keep the emphasis firmly upon the *regnum Italiae*.

In particular I will analyze the poetic evidence about the Carolingians in Italy, which is the best documented aspect of Italian literary culture. But first I should like to consider more generally the Carolingian patronage of learning in Italy. This is partly in order to provide some context for the more substantial poetic evidence discussed below and partly because these more scattered references are too slender to stand alone. Nevertheless I believe that they are suggestive.

Three major Lombard scholars Peter of Pisa, Paulinus of Aquileia and Paul the Deacon are well known to have made important contributions to the development of learning at Charlemagne's court in the 780s.⁶ Although Paulinus became patriarch of Aquileia and Paul retired to Montecassino in 787, where he lived on for perhaps more than a decade, neither seems to have played any great part in the dissemination of a Carolingian ideology in Italy. Indeed Paul's later writings have sometimes been characterized as 'Lombard' in tone.⁷ Neither wrote works for Pippin of Italy although

⁶Again there is substantial work on the three Lombard scholars: e.g. Godman, *Poets and Emperors*, (Oxford, 1985), pp. 41-55; D. A. Bullough, 'Aula Renovata: the Court before the Aachen Palace', *Carolingian Renewal*, (Manchester, 1991), pp. 267-301, esp. 131, 134-136.

⁷E.g. Goffart, *Narrators*, pp. 344, 347 who hypothesizes that Paul the Deacon's *Historia Langobardorum* was written for Grimoald III of Benevento.

as a metropolitan Paulinus did write for Charlemagne, at least as a theologian (however I do not consider his involvement with adoptionism and the *Libri Carolini* 'Italian' and therefore will not discuss it here⁸).

Others did however write for Pippin. Angilbert of St. Riquier wrote a panegyrical poem about him⁹ and an anonymous author wrote a laudatory account of Pippin's victory over the Avars [see below]. Perhaps equally important Alcuin wrote a dialogue between himself and Pippin as master and pupil, modelled on classical dialogues.¹⁰ This has sometimes led to the unwarranted claim that Pippin was Alcuin's pupil.¹¹ Amongst Charlemagne's sons great prestige appears to have been attached to the provision of such texts by Alcuin, if a reference in another of his letters is to be believed. Alcuin claims Louis the Pious had keenly requested that he send an exhortatory work like those presented to Louis's older brothers.¹² This possibly suggests a fraternal literary rivalry. The 110-question dialogue of Pippin with Albinus (who gives metaphorical answers to Pippin's questions)¹³ takes a slightly more interesting turn when, twenty-one questions from the end Pippin begins to provide answers and Albinus to pose questions - presumably a demonstration of the pupil's new-found skills.¹⁴ Eighth century poetry often praised the ruler's learning,¹⁵ perhaps the implication here is that Pippin has equalled Alcuin's learning.

⁸E.g. for an overview J. Herrin, *Formation of Christendom*, (London, 1987), pp. 437-40, 470-2. with further refs.

⁹*MGH PLAC* I pp. 358-60. See below.

¹⁰*PL* 101, 975-80; superior edition in *Altercatio Hadriani, Augusti et Epicteti Philosophi*, eds. L. W. Daly & W. Suchier, (Urbana, 1939), pp. 137-43. There are four tenth-century manuscripts and six later ones; see Daly & Suchier, pp. 134-7; *ibid.* p. 85, no. 1 for classical influences.

¹¹R. Bezzola, *Les Origines et la Formation de la Littérature Courtoise en Occident 500-1200*, (Paris, 1944), vol. I, p. 131.

¹²*MGH Ep.* I, no. 119, p. 174; H. H. Anton, *Fürstenspiegel und Herrscherethos in der Karolingerzeit* (Bonner Historischer Studien), pp. 88-95, esp. 95.

¹³D. Schaller, 'Alcuin', *Die Deutsche Literatur des Mittelalters. Verfasserlexikon*, Bd. I (1978), col. 252.

¹⁴G. Baesecke, *Das lateinisch-althochdeutsch Reimgebet (Carmen ad Deum) und das Rätsel vom Vogel federlos*, (Probleme der Wissenschaft in Vergangenheit und Gegenwart 1; Berlin, 1948), pp. 35-6.

¹⁵Godman, *Poets and Emperors*, pp. 45-9, 53: e.g. cf. Paul the Deacon's praise of members of the Lombard royal family in the intro. to *Historia Romana* ed. H. Droysen (*MGH - Ex Usur Scholarum*, 1879), p. 1. On the philosophical theories underlying the dialogue: A. Borst, *Der Turmbau von Babel*, (Stuttgart, 1958), vol. II.1, pp. 490-1.

Hincmar claimed his *De ordine palatii* was based on a similar pamphlet written for Pippin by Adalhard of Corbie,¹⁶ who like Angilbert was one of Pippin's *baiuli*.¹⁷ This report has, however, been doubted and it seems that only a part of Adalhard's work was recycled.¹⁸ Moreover since it is doubtful to what extent this work was 'Italian' I shall not discuss it. The *Historia Langobardorum Codicis Gothanis (HLCG)*¹⁹ was written between 806-10 [see above ch. 2] and it has sometimes been attributed to Pippin's court at Verona,²⁰ although its positive tone need not be the product of a courtly milieu and its relationship with a law manuscript must make it likely it was intended as an introduction to the legal texts, similar to the *Origo gentis langobardorum*. Nothing is known from the reign of Bernard. Lothar I spent only the years 834-9 in Italy continuously, but it is probable that as a result of his 825 capitulary schools were established (or reinforced) in a number of chief towns in Italy. The major scholar the Irishman Dungal was installed in Pavia (the school with the single largest catchment area).²¹ Other un-named Irish scholars were to be found in Milan under archbishop Tado (860-8)²² and traces of Irish Easter tables have recently been found in a computistical manuscript from either Verona or Brescia.²³ This dovetails with Dungal's own astrological and mathematical expertise.²⁴ From the late 840s and early 850s we know another Irishman, Sedulius Scottus, wrote three poems about (or

¹⁶Hincmar, *De Ordine Palatii*, MGH Fontes (1980).

¹⁷D. A. Bullough, 'Baiuli in the Carolingian *Regnum Langobardorum*' and the Career of Abbot Waldo (†813)', *EHR* CCCV (1962), pp. 625-37, at 635 & n. 6; B. Kasten, *Adalhard von Corbie* (1986), pp. 42-9; S. Rabe, *Faith, Art and Politics Angilbert of St. Riquier*, (Philadelphia, 1995), pp. 71-3.

¹⁸J. Devisse, *Hincmar Archevêque de Reims*, (Geneva, 1975-6) pp. 999-1001 accepts Hincmar's attribution; but contra H. Löwe, 'Hinkmar von Reims und der Apocrisiar', *Festschrift H. Heimpel*, (1972), vol. 3, pp. 197-225; J. L. Nelson, 'Legislation and Consensus in the Reign of Charles the Bald', *Politics and Ritual in the Early Middle Ages*, (London, 1986), pp. 103-11. Cf B. Kasten, *Adalhard von Corbie. Die Biographie eines karolingischen Politikers- und Klostervorstehers*, (Studia Humaniora Bd. 3; 1986), pp. 72-84 who claims she can identify 'Italian' terms in the text.

¹⁹MGH SS RL pp. 9-11; new edition in *Le Leggi dei Longobardi*, ed. C. Azzara pp. 282-9.

²⁰S. Gasparri's intro. to Azzara, *Leggi*, p. xxxv.

²¹MGH Capit. II, no. 163, c. 6, p. 327 (a. 825); for manuscript evidence of Dungal's presence: M. Ferrari, '"In Pavia convenient ad Dungalum"', *IMU* XV (1972), pp. 1-54.

²²MGH PLAC III, pp. 232-6; A. Paredi, 'Nota storica sul Salterio Milanese del IX secolo', *Miniature Altomedievali Lombarde* (Milan, 1978), pp. 151-75 at 162; M. Navoni, *DMilano*, (Varese, 1992), t. 1, p. 108.

²³D. O Croinin, 'The 'Lost' Irish 84-Year Easter Table Rediscovered', *Peritia* 6-7 (1987), pp. 227-42.

²⁴B. S. Eastwood, 'The Astronomy of Macrobius in Carolingian Europe: Dungal's Letter of 811 to Charles the Great', *Early Medieval Europe* 3, 2 (1994), pp. 117-34.

partially about) Louis, the most important of which celebrated his exploits in the south against the Arabs.²⁵

Within the *regnum Italiae* under Louis II Anastasius Bibliothecarius perhaps wrote for Louis a letter to the Byzantine emperor Michael III defending the 'Frankish' imperial title.²⁶ The Anastasius referred to in Flodoard of Rheims's *Historia Remensis Ecclesiae* who taught Louis's daughter Irmingarde may well be the same although this is not certain.²⁷ Louis's wife, Angilberga, was the recipient of verses (now lost) from abbot Bertarius of Montecassino.²⁸ During his campaigns in the south (probably in 871 ?²⁹) Louis is said to have gathered many men of learning around him at Benevento.³⁰ It has been suggested that the poem condemning Louis II's imprisonment in Benevento was written at his command, although I am doubtful of this [see below].

These scattered fragments suggest that the Italian rulers were not uninterested in patronage or learning. Writers from outside the *regnum italiae*, like Alcuin and Sedulius, felt it worth their while to provide works for the Italian Carolingians (indeed there is more evidence for those writing outside the kingdom sending their works to court than for those within it). In the case of Pippin the important role played by his own *baiuli*, Angilbert and Adalhard, is striking. But none of this could be said to amount to a 'court school'.

We cannot even attempt, as we can for other areas of the empire, to contextualize the Carolingian patronage of literature by considering manuscripts in Italy. No book

²⁵MGH PLAC III, no. xxv, pp. 191-2, ll. 19f; see below.

²⁶MGH Ep. VII, pp. 385-94.

²⁷Letter no. 9 in Flodoard c. 27, MGH SS XIII; M. Sot, *Un Historien et son Église: Flodoard de Reims* (1993), p. 610 on Hincmar's letter to Ermengarde; but cf. p. 659 Hincmar's letter to a Roman abbot called Anastasius. Given that this text was not collated by Flodoard possibly it means he did not know it, therefore for Flodoard the only Anastasius was the papal Librarian. This does not however help us identify the Anastasius in question.

²⁸*Chronica Monasterii Casinensis* (MGH SS XXXIV) I, c. 33, p. 90 ed. H. Hoffman:....*versos quoque perplures ad Angilbergam augustam aliosque amicos suos, mira conscripti facundia*, and n. 7.

²⁹BMZ *Regesten*, no. 321, p. 131 seems most likely; but no. 330, p. 136 is also possible.

³⁰*Chronicon Salernitanum* ed. Westerbergh, c. 122, p. 134; A. Lentini, 'La Grammatica d'Ilderico documento dell'attività letteraria di Paolo Diacono', *Medioevo Letterario Casinese*, (Miscellanea Casinese 57; [orig. publ.in *Atti del 2° Congresso Internazionale di studi sull'alto Medioevo*, (Spoleto, 1952)], pp. 451-89 at 452-4.

survives directly associated with either Pippin or Bernard.³¹ The famous manuscripts associated with Lothar are all attributed to non-Italian scriptoria.³² Only one manuscript perhaps associated with Louis II survives, a very fine sacramentary for the monastery of S. Sisto in Piacenza - but although this is certainly of imperial standard its dedicatory poem suggests it may well be a donation by Angelberga, the monastery's founder, rather than Louis and may even date from after his death.³³ It is a remarkable but unfortunate fact that this represents the sum total of our knowledge of manuscript production in Italy concerning the Carolingians.

Poems: the body of poems surviving from Carolingian Italy is certainly not as large as that from the rest of the Frankish territories. But then there are only a handful of such works from the Lombard period.³⁴ I shall consider the texts themselves first and later their manuscript tradition which is in some ways revealing. It is very striking that the earliest reference to a Carolingian ruler in an Italian poem is closely linked to a Lombard exemplar. The *Versus de Verona* refers in its penultimate verse to the fact that 'the great king Pippin' lived in the city.³⁵ This comment has led scholars to date the poem between 781-810 and more specifically it has been assumed, probably after 796 when Pippin's success against the Avars raised his profile. This reference is also the only direct evidence that Pippin used Verona as a residence, although given the paucity of evidence for Pippin's residence anywhere, it is as likely that Verona was the location

³¹Although H. Mordek, 'Ein Bildnis König Bernhards von Italien ? Zum Frontispiz in Cod. St. Paul (Kärnten), Stiftsbibliothek 4/1', *Società, Istituzioni, Spiritualità. Studi in Onore di Cinzio Violante*, (Spoleto, 1994), t. 2, pp. 547-55, and *ibid.* 'Frühmittelalterliche Gesetzgeber und Iustitia im Miniaturen weltlicher Rechtshandschriften', *La Giustizia nell'Alto Medioevo (secoli V-VIII)*, (SSpol XLII - 1994, publ. 1995), pp. 997-1052 at 1005f. has hypothesized that this manuscript's frontispiece represents Bernard.

³²Eds. W. Koehler & F. Mutherich, *Die Karolingischen Miniaturen IV: Die Hofschule Kaiser Lothars*, (Berlin, 1971).

³³Piacenza, Biblioteca Comunale Ms. 2; P. E. Schramm & F. Mutherich, *Denkmale der Deutschen Könige und Kaiser*, (Veröffentlichungen des Zentralinstituts für Kunstgeschichte in München II - 1962), p. 129, no. 40.

³⁴Excluding inscriptions and the works of Paul the Deacon there survive from 568-774 only a verse life of S. Zeno of doubtful date (*PL* 11, 204-6 = *MGH PLAC* IV, ed. Strecker, no. LI, pp. 577-80), the verse celebrating Cunipert's 698 Pavia synod (*MGH SS RL* pp. 190-1) and the *versus Mediolanensis*: see below.

³⁵*MGH PLAC* I, pp. 120-2 at 122; best new edition and commentary G. B. Pighi, *Versus de Verona, Versum de Mediolano civitate* (Studi Pubblicati dall'Istituto di Filologia Classica VII - Univ. di Bologna, Faccoltà di Lettere e Filosofia. 1960): *magnus habitat in te rex Pippinus piissimus*.

of his court as anywhere else.³⁶ The *Versus de Verona* is a praise poem about the city, apparently influenced, as several scholars have noticed, by a similar poetic laudation of Milan dated from internal evidence c. 737-9.³⁷ Both survive in the same manuscript [see below]. Both these verses have attracted considerable attention and have generally, probably rightly, been considered as a pair. The Verona poem has been seen as a response to the Milanese verses, a kind of pre-echo of civic rivalry.³⁸ The Verona poet appears to have been careful not only to match the structural elements of his predecessor by, for example, listing Verona's resident saints (just as the Milan poet did) but also to try and outdo the Milanese poet in extolling the glories of Verona by emphasizing not only the Christian monuments but also those of the pagan imperial era.³⁹ Further the author of the Verona poem aimed at hyper-correctness of structure, apparently modelling his work on a set of antique grammatical rules.⁴⁰ The influence of the Milanese poem on the *Versus de Verona* is important because it provided a source for a reference to royal links with the city. Archbishop Theodore and his brother, king Liutprand, furnish the association in the Milan poem.⁴¹ Thus the *Versus de Verona* mention Pippin not necessarily because of any specific interest in the king himself (the poem is after all about the *city* and also refers to Desiderius and Adelchis⁴²) but

³⁶A. Settia, in *Storia di Pavia* (Pavia, 1987), vol. II p. 76 takes civic loyalty too far when he seeks to entirely dismiss this as evidence for Pippin's court; he does not consider that Pippin also paid for the restoration of the cathedral at Verona.

³⁷*Versus Mediolanensis*, MGH PLAC I pp. 24-6; relationship to the Verona poem: J. K. Hyde, 'Medieval Descriptions of Cities', *Bulletin of the John Rylands Library* 48 (1965-6), pp. 308-40, at 311-14; J. C. Picard, 'Conscience Urbaine et Culte des Saints. De Milan sous Liutprand à Vérone sous Pepin Ier d'Italie', *Hagiographie, Culture et Sociétés IV-XII siècles* (Paris, 1981), pp. 455-69, at 458-9; a useful summary of previous work by R. Avesani, 'La Cultura Veronese dal secolo IX al secolo XII', *Storia della Cultura Veneta*, vol. I (Vicenza, 1976), pp. 245-8; Godman, *Poetry*, pp. 29-31; P. Zanna, '«Descriptiones Urbium» and Elegy in Latin and Vernaculars in the Early Middle Ages. At the Crossroads Between Civic Engagement, Artistic Enthusiasm and Religious Meditation', *Studi Medievali* XXXII, II (1991), pp. 523-48, esp. 538-46

³⁸G. Fasoli, 'La Coscienza Civica nelle «Laudes Civitatum»', *Scritti*, pp. 293-318, esp. pp. 300-4.

³⁹Godman, *Poetry*, p. 30.

⁴⁰Hyde, 'Descriptions', p. 312; Zanna, «Descriptiones», p. 539.

⁴¹MGH PLAC I p. 26, vv.18-19: *Sceptrum inde Langobardi optinent, Liutprandum pium regem meritis almificum, cui tantam sanctitatis Christus dedit gratiam* [sic]. *Totam urbem presul magnus ornavit Theodorus, veniens benigne, natus de regali germine, quem ad sedem raptum traxit pro amore populus*. On Theodore's burial: Picard, *Souvenir*, p. 335; on Liutprand's sister as abbess of S. Maria Aurora in Milan *ibid.* p. 87.

⁴²Ll. 70-2, *Quando complacuit domno* [God]...*sunt facta renovata...temporibus principum regum Desiderii et Adelchii*.

because of his association with Verona. In this sense the comment tells us little about the view of Pippin from a Veronese perspective because we cannot tell much except that the Milan poem's royal reference required a royal response from the Veronese author.⁴³ Disquietingly, given the Verona author's one-upmanship, his claim that Pippin lived in the city may reflect a desire to outdo the Milanese poet, for whom the link with Liutprand was indirect. However, despite this, the Verona poem does suggest that prestige was attached to the presence in a city of the king. To what extent this prestige was specifically *Carolingian* is open to doubt. It was the presence of a royal figure, not the presence of a Frankish ruler, which marked out Verona's special eminence.

For Pippin the key texts are two praise poems, one by Angilbert of St. Riquier,⁴⁴ the other by an anonymous poet celebrating the victory over the Avars.⁴⁵ Angilbert of St. Riquier's poem is nearly contemporary with the Avar *Rhythmus*. It can be dated between 794-800 because of references to court personnel.⁴⁶ More specifically Angilbert's 796 journey to Rome as *missus*⁴⁷ provided an obvious opportunity for him to deliver the poem to Pippin, hence c. 796 is often suggested as the poem's date.⁴⁸ The poem opens with an *adventus* ceremony where Pippin is greeted with enthusiasm by the people. He is portrayed enforcing the law and supervizing the actions of his *missi*. However the poem then moves on to place Pippin in the context of his family. His father, two royal brothers, and several sisters are all included in the account. The image Angilbert paints of a united imperial family⁴⁹ is given special resonance since we are certain that he knew most (possibly all) of those in the poem personally. He was

⁴³I reject Fasoli, 'Coscienza' p. 303, (followed by Avesani, 'Cultura Veronese', *SCultura Veneta* I, p. 248) who suggests the poem expressed the hope Pippin would re-establish Lombard independence with Verona as capital. Noble, 'Bernard', pp. 315-26 decisively disproved the old 'Lombard nationalism' idea.

⁴⁴*MGH PLAC* I pp. 358-60.

⁴⁵*MGH PLAC* I pp. 116-17.

⁴⁶Especially the reference to Charlemagne's fourth wife, Liutgard, d. 800: *Annales regni Francorum*, a. 800; J. L. Nelson, 'La Famille de Charlemagne', *Byzantion* LXI (1991). *Le Souverain à Byzance et en Occident du VIIIe au Xe siècle. Hommage à la Mémoire de Maurice Leroy*, eds. A. Dierkens & J. M. Sansterre, pp. 194-212, at 207.

⁴⁷*MGH Ep.* IV, nos. 92, 93, 94; Rabe, *Faith*, p. 75.

⁴⁸D. Schaller, 'Angilbert von St. Riquier', *Verfasserlexikon*, Bd. I (1978), col. 362.

⁴⁹Rabe, *Faith*, pp. 75-6.

Charlemagne's *capellanus*, Pippin's *baiulus* and Berta's lover.⁵⁰ He almost certainly knew Charles the Younger and Louis the Pious, and given Angilbert's intimacy with Bertha and Einhard's claim that almost all of Charlemagne's daughters lived at court⁵¹ one presumes he knew Bertha's sisters too. Clearly this image of imperial family unity was one the Carolingians would have been keen to foster. But Angilbert's very closeness to the Carolingians probably makes his account unacceptable as reportage. It is however important since it most likely reveals the kind of 'family' image which the Carolingians sought to project. Following Pippin the Hunchback's rebellion in 792⁵² an ideal of family unity was an obvious corrective to the risk of rebellion. Alcuin's reference concerning the provision of moral guidance to Louis the Pious implies that by the mid-790s Charlemagne's three legitimate male heirs could be thought of as a unit. In an expanded form (taking in other members of the family) this image is also found in Angilbert's poem.⁵³ That this poem was destined for Pippin may not have been incidental. It was perhaps intended as a gentle reminder that Pippin's future security lay with the rest of his family.

The Avars verses are well-known. It has been tentatively implied they may have been designed to be recited or sung⁵⁴. This raises the tantalizing possibility of the use of Avar verses in a public assembly, but can remain no more than a hypothesis. The exact origin of the verses is unknown although Verona is often suggested. There is in fact no evidence specifically linking the poem to Verona. Jarnut's effort to find congruences between the *HLCG* and the Avar poem's account correctly identifies a common approach to the Avars (special emphasis on the Avars as the despoilers of Christian churches⁵⁵) but his attempt to support the claim that the *HLCG* comes from Verona by reference to the Avar poem is a circular argument. Although this does not

⁵⁰Rabe, *Faith*, pp. 71-6.

⁵¹Einhard, *Vita Karoli Magni*, c. 19.

⁵²K. Brunner, *Oppositionelle Gruppen im Karolingerreich*, (Veröffentlichungen des Instituts für Österreichische Geschichtsforschung XXV; Vienna, Cologne, Graz, 1979), pp. 62f.

⁵³More practically in the *divisio regni* of 806: *MGH Cap.* I no. 45 pp. 126-30.

⁵⁴Godman, *Poetry*, p. 31: 'as a poem intended to be sung or recited, or as a text designed to be read, it is no less versatile than the *Versus de Verona*'; also Ebenbauer, *Carmen Historicum*, p. 33.

⁵⁵W. Pohl, *Die Awaren. Eine Steppenvolk in Mitteleuropa*, (Munich, 1988), pp. 313-14.

allow us to locate either the poem or the text geographically Jarnut's analysis does offer a sidelight: this view of the Avars was a common one in the *regnum langobardorum* under Pippin and certainly one Pippin would have been happy to promote (the panegyric nature of the poem has been commented upon repeatedly).⁵⁶ Alcuin had supported attacks on the heathen in his letter to Pippin.⁵⁷ This kind of approach is frequent in the sources of the era⁵⁸ and cannot simply be regarded as a 'Veronese' (or even north Italian) attitude.

I will deal with the manuscript traditions of the poems later but shall make an exception here because if one accepts Bischoff's attribution of the manuscript to 'Austrasia'⁵⁹ there is no direct evidence of the poem in Italy at all. But the codicology of the manuscript does support an 'Italian' context albeit without providing definitive proof. The Avar poem is recorded on fols. 127-8. On fol. 126 there survives a verse concerning the miracles of St. Donatus of Arezzo. Elsewhere the codex also preserves a list of the Italian kings, apparently drawn from Augustine and a copy of Peter of Pisa's grammar,⁶⁰ known from only two other manuscripts, both of Italian origin. Consider that by the time the Avar verses were written (796) Peter had returned to Italy.⁶¹ Bischoff too noted that Berlin Diez. B. 66 had reached Italy by the early tenth century at the latest.⁶² The Avar poem is not added on extra leaves and therefore provides at least a *terminus post quem* for the copying of the codex. Bischoff's attribution of the manuscript is entirely based on the script type he discerned. But scribes could travel bringing their script with them. One must at least consider the possibility that Diez B. 66, or part of its exemplars, originated in Italy. Recently Villa

⁵⁶F. Ebert, *Allgemeine Geschichte der Literatur des Mittelalters im Abendlande*, II, p. 86 characterized it as a 'Triumph- und Danklied'; Szövérfy, *Weltliche Dichtungen*, p. 510 calls it a secular victory poem ('weltliche Siegeslied'); cf. Ebenbauer, *Carmen Historicum*, p. 33.

⁵⁷MGH Ep. II no. 119, p. 174; Anton, *Fürstenspiegel* p. 94.

⁵⁸Godman, *Poetry*, p. 187, n. to l. 1ff; Pohl, *Awaren*, pp. 313-14.

⁵⁹B. Bischoff, 'Frühkarolingische Handschriften und ihre Heimat', *Scriptorium* 22 (1968), pp. 306-14 at 307.

⁶⁰B. Bischoff, *Sammelhandschrift Diez. B. 66* (Grammatici Latini Catalogus Librorum; Graz, 1973) [facsimile], pp. 17 (Avar verses), 38 (Donatus), 21 (Peter of Pisa), 22 (king list); Italian king list from *De Civitate Dei*, XVIII, cc. 15, 16, 19, 21.

⁶¹Bullough, 'Aula Renovata', p. 131 suggests c. 790.

⁶²Bischoff, *Berlin Diez. B. 66*, p. 23.

has argued that the famous list on pp. 218-19 believed by Bischoff⁶³ to list Charlemagne's court library is actually a list of codices to be copied; a florilegium of 1329 still preserved in Verona (Bib. Cap. CLXVIII (155)) reproduces the same list of works in exactly the same order. This is striking since the arrangement of Terence's comedies in the lists is unique, and this exceptional congruence is reinforced by the inclusion in both of very rare texts (Claudian, Tibullus). This suggests the Berlin Diez. B. 66 so-called 'library list' was provided by an Italian source⁶⁴ which fits with my argument above. It does provide a case for a Veronese origin for the poem,⁶⁵ since Verona is where the florilegium is preserved, but as I have shown above the associated texts could also be thought to have a Tuscan origin.

Structurally the Avar poem has long been understood as three five-strophe sections, one on the Avars splitting introductory and concluding strophes.⁶⁶ The concluding strophe is also a doxology. Each forty-five syllable strophe (three fifteen-syllable⁶⁷ lines) is the terminus of a discrete grammatical and narrative unit. There are thus fifteen verses echoing the fifteen-syllable line. Structurally the Avar verses (three-line, fifteen syllable strophes) are not unusual in Italian poetry of the period. On the contrary, a similar syllable-scheme is found in Angilbert's poem and in the Louis II *Rhythmus* but there seems no reason to assume a link.

The two key ideological themes in the poem are intertwined. The first, in a clear reference to the Papacy's support, is that St. Peter was sent by Christ to aid Pippin. The second is the emphasis in the Avar poem on the bloodless nature of the victory

⁶³B. Bischoff, 'Die Hofbibliothek Karls des Großen', *Mittelalterliche Studien*, (Stuttgart, 1981), III, pp. 162-9; note the manuscript is paginated.

⁶⁴C. Villa, 'I Classici', *Lo Spazio Letterario del Medioevo I, Il Medioevo Latino: la Produzione del Testo*, eds. G. Cavallo, C. Leonardi, E. Menestò (Rome, 1992), pp. 479-522, at 494-7.

⁶⁵I understand Prof. Bullough is preparing a paper on 'Charlemagne's court library list' and its probable origin in Verona.

⁶⁶Ebenbauer, *Carmen Historicum*, pp. 31-2.

⁶⁷D. Norberg, *L'Accentuation des Mots dans le vers latin du Moyen Age*, (Filologiskt arkiv 32; Stockholm, 1985), p. 7 gives the line structure as 8+7. At least each line is *notionally* 15 syllables; in fact the poet is somewhat irregular in his syllable count but it is evident that 15 syllables is his ideal. No pattern is obvious other than error, or perhaps syllabic elision, (which might indicate something about the poet's pronunciation: cf. Bullough, 'Aula Renovata', pp. 134-5 on Paul the Deacon's pronunciation) which might explain the stress scheme, which is as follows: Verse 1) 16, 15, 15; 2) 15, 15, 16; 3) 16, 16, 16; 4) 15, 15, 16; 5) 15, 15, 15; 6) 16, 15, 16; 7) 15, 15, 15; 8) 15, 16, 15; 9) 15, 16, 15; 10) 14, 15, 15; 11) 15, 16, 16; 12) 16, 15, 15; 13) 16, 16, 15; 14) 15, 15, 16; 15) 15, 17, 15.

over the heathen.⁶⁸ Pippin's mere presence in Avar territory was enough to cause the khagan to give all his lands, *primates* and even his children into Pippin's *dominatio*. This was not only Christian victory, it was also painless. In the poem an Avar noble, Unguimer,⁶⁹ articulates the view that only abject immediate surrender will save the khagan. He must offer rich gifts and pay respect to the symbols of Pippin's royal power⁷⁰. The Avar kingdom has already been given into the hands of Pippin and the Franks by God (v. 7 *regna vestra* [of the khagan] *diu longe Cristianis tradita*). The Avars are in accord that resistance is useless; this view is articulated by Unguimer but evidently supported by others since when the khagan surrenders to Pippin he does so with his *primates*.

Two aspects of the Avar poem's language which have drawn special attention are its echoes of liturgical vocabulary and its use of legal phrases (specifically commendation, to describe the khagan's surrender to Pippin)⁷¹. That the poems include traces of specialized vocabulary need not surprise us. The same is true of the *Versus de Verona* whose description of the scent of saints' relics is heavily influenced by Old Testament language.⁷² This does suggest however that there was no specialized vocabulary for royal poetry. Certainly absent is any use of Roman models. However the reference to Pippin as *rex catholicus* in v. 5 as he pitches camp near the Danube may be influenced by the use of this term in Lombard royal documents.⁷³ As I noted legal terminology is found in other parts of the poem. The Danube was the frontier of the Roman Empire. The poet may have hoped to emphasize Pippin as Christian king moving across this frontier from Christian territories to the pagan Avar lands.

⁶⁸Bezzola, *Littérature*, p. 130 (repeated by Ebenbauer, *Carmen Historicum*, p. 349 n. 188) seems to me quite wrong to claim this poem has 'un accent guerrier'.

⁶⁹Although Ebenbauer, *Carmen Historicum*, p. 31 considers this a Germanic name.

⁷⁰V. 9 *tolle cito, porta tecum copiosa munera; / sceptrum regis adorare,...aurum, gemmas illi offer...*

⁷¹Godman, *Poetry*, p. 189 n.

⁷²G. Ropa, 'La "Spiritalis Intelligentia" del Versus de Verona', *Quadrivium* V (1962), pp. 69-100, esp. 71-87.

⁷³E.g. Ann. 23 (735 A.D.): *...ego Liutprand excellentissimus christianus atque catholicus rex gentis langobardorum*. ed. Azzara p. 254.

Lastly we have a famous lament for Charlemagne's death,⁷⁴ presumed to have been written in 814 or soon after.⁷⁵ The poet's invocation of St. Columbanus has led to the work being associated with Bobbio,⁷⁶ although there is no other reference to localize the text.⁷⁷ I shall again make an exception and briefly consider this poem's manuscript tradition: it survives in four manuscripts, the earliest Verona Biblioteca Capitolare Cod. XC. I presume, although it has never been specifically stated, that it is because this north Italian manuscript is the earliest copy of the verse that a Bobbio origin is assumed. However the issue is more complex than is often allowed. Two tenth-century manuscripts, Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale Lat. 1154,⁷⁸ and Brussels 8860-8867, and one eleventh century manuscript, Trier, Bibliothèque Capitulaire 133, also preserve the Bobbio *planctus* (or as I shall refer to it the Columbanus lament). In addition there appears to have been a copy in a now-lost Fulda codex, from which an edition of the poem was taken in the seventeenth century.⁷⁹ Further Columbanus was venerated at St. Gall, the place of origin of one of the manuscript copies and a foundation of one of the saint's disciples.⁸⁰ Moreover pushing back the date of the compilation of the Verona manuscript into the early tenth century⁸¹ weakens the case for assuming that the Italian copy of the poem was necessarily that closest to the original. The Verona manuscript does contain a couple of poems certainly of non-Italian origin (by Alcuin and Notker the Stammerer)⁸² so in codicological terms it would not be exceptional

⁷⁴MGH PLAC I pp. 435-6.

⁷⁵Godman, *Poetry*, p. 207 n.

⁷⁶M. Lapidge, 'The Authorship of the Adonic Verses 'ad Fidolium' Attributed to Columbanus', *SM* XVIII, II (1977), pp. 249-314 attempted to understand Columban as the poet's name but was decisively rejected by H. Löwe, 'Columbanus und Fidolius', *DA* 37 (1981), pp. 1-19, esp. 1-12. on the links between Bobbio and Verona: Ferrari, 'Libri e Maestri tra Verona e Bobbio', *SCultura Veneta* II, pp. 271-8.

⁷⁷G. G. Meersseman, 'Il Codice XC della Capitolare di Verona', *Archivio Veneto*, ser. 5 vol. CIV (1975), pp. 11-44, at p. 16, no. 23, fols. 45r-46r.

⁷⁸Ed. P. Lauer, *Catalogue Général des Manuscrits Latins*, I (Paris, 1939), p. 421; J. Chailley, *L'École Musicale de St. Martial de Limoges jusqu'à la Fin du XIe siècle*, (Paris, 1960), pp. 73-8.

⁷⁹MGH PLAC I p. 434 Duemmler's notes. Cf. on the Paris manuscript: ed. Lauer, *Catalogue*, p. 421.

⁸⁰Ed. W. Volger, *Die Kultur der Abtei Sankt Gallen*, (St. Gall, 1990), p. 29 [for *Brüdergemeinschaft* with Bobbio by 846], 125 [for Columban's works in the abbey library].

⁸¹Meersseman, 'Codice XC', pp. 11-12; G. P. Marchi, 'Il "Versus de Nativitate" del Codice XC della Biblioteca Capitolare di Verona', *Medievo e Latinità in Memoria di Ezio Franceschini*, eds. A. Ambrosioni, M. Ferrari, C. Leonardi, G. Picasso, M. Regoliosi, P. Zerbi (Univ. Cattolica del Sacro Cuore, 1993), pp. 261-5, at 261.

⁸²Meersseman, 'Codice XC', p. 19, no. 51 & p. 17, no. 29.

were the Columbanus lament to be from outside Italy. Alternatively there is a Veronese option. A small monastic cell in Bardolino was dedicated to Columbanus. Unfortunately its existence is not attested before the tenth century⁸³, but Pippin, presumably with Charlemagne's consent, did grant other property in Bardolino to S. Zeno in Verona⁸⁴. In this context a Veronese writer might have invoked Columbanus's help for the late emperor.

Further Godman suggests that the context of the preservation of the *planctus* in Paris lat. 1154 with neums 'reflect a characteristic of early Carolingian rhythmical poetry: the natural co-existence of features of recitation and performance...' Godman also points to the derivation of the first line of the lament from a hymn of Caelius Sedulius, presumably to support his inference that there is a performative aspect to the poem. However the neums which prove that the poem was chanted or sung survive *only* in the Paris manuscript. As I indicated above the Columbanus lament's manuscript tradition is richer than Godman indicates. Moreover the version of the *planctus* preserved in Paris 1154 is substantially different from that in any of the other manuscripts: for example the famous refrain *heu mihi misero* is rendered *heu me dolens plango* in 2,3; strophes 6, 8-10 are omitted entirely, as is the very last line and 11, 2 is altered from *amisso summo glorioso Karolo* to *hac misit signo glorioso Karolo*.⁸⁵ Although these changes do not affect the metrical values of these lines, they do show that the textual tradition of the lament was far from stable and this must therefore cast doubt on the validity of inferring from the context of one version of the *planctus* conclusions about the nature of versions preserved in other manuscripts. That the Paris manuscript preserves a version of the Columbanus lament designed to be performed is not in doubt. That the Verona manuscript's substantially different version was designed to be recited is not however demonstrable on the basis of the later Paris

⁸³M. Millar, *The Formation of a Medieval Church. Ecclesiastical Change in Verona 950-1150*, (Cornell, 1993), no. 5, p. 25; no. 8, p. 36; cf. p. 26 for the history of the Garda shore in the eighth/ninth centuries.

⁸⁴P. Verzone, *L'Architettura Religiosa dell'Alto Medioevo nell'Italia Settentrionale*, (Milan, 1942), p. 131.

⁸⁵Duemmler's notes p. 435 to 2,3; 6; 8-10; 11,2; 11,3.

manuscript's neums. Moreover it is clear that many of the other poems in Verona cod. XC were *abecedarii* which I would suggest are visual verse forms whose format is most obvious on the page rather than in recitation.⁸⁶

Nevertheless the poem does exist in an Italian manuscript and deserves consideration. The poet invokes, united in lamentation, the whole of society⁸⁷, variously organized by age and status (*infantes, senes, gloriosi praesules,/ matronae plangunt...*⁸⁸), by region (*vae tibi Roma...vae tibi sola formonsa Italia...Francia...nullum iam talem dolorem sustinuit*⁸⁹), by race (*Franci, Romani...Roma Romanoque populo*⁹⁰) and lastly by social status, with a special emphasis on the weak, who, perhaps in an echo of capitulary legislation, were presumably supposed to miss Charlemagne's protection most keenly (*Pater communis, orfanorum omnium, peregrinorum, viduarum, virginum*⁹¹). Indeed the whole world mourns the emperor (*..nam plangit orbis interitum Karoli*⁹²). This is a vision of all the faithful united not only in grief but also in prayers of intercession on behalf of Charlemagne - no less than seven of the twenty strophes are requests for the emperor's soul to be received in Heaven.⁹³ Invocations are made directly to Christ in str. 7, to the Holy Spirit in str. 10, and to God in str. 18-20; requests for Charlemagne's soul come in str. 8 from *omnes fideles et creduli*, and Columbanus's intercession is requested in str. 17.

Above all the poem places emphasis on Christian elements both by invocations to St. Columbanus, as mentioned above, but also separately to Christ and God, and by describing those mourning Charlemagne's death as *cuncti creduli*,⁹⁴ *omnes fideles et*

⁸⁶Contra C. Russo-Mailler, 'La politica meridionale di Ludovico II e il "Rythmus de captivitate Ludovici imperatoris"', *Quaderni Medievali* 14 (Dec. 1982), pp. 6-27, unconvincingly. See below.

⁸⁷Godman, *Poetry*, p. 32.

⁸⁸V. 4, ll.10-11.

⁸⁹Vv. 11, 12, 13.

⁹⁰Vv. 3, 11. Note that the three named regions may echo those which occur in Charlemagne's title: *rex Francorum et Langobardorum atque patricius Romanorum* with *Italia* standing in for *Langobardia*: cf. from 806-10 (Azzara, *Leggi*, p. xxxv) the *Historia Langobardorum Codicis Gothanis*, c. 9 which speaks of the *regnum italiae*.

⁹¹V. 6

⁹²V. 5.

⁹³Vv. 7, 8, 10, 17 (the Columbanus invocation), 18, 19, 20.

⁹⁴Godman, *Poetry*, p. 207, no. 26, v. 3.

*creduli*⁹⁵ and, later, as the *christianus populus*.⁹⁶ Clearly Charlemagne's death is being presented as a great Christian disaster. There are affinities here with the Christian triumphalism associated with the Avar poem, although obviously reversed. Instead of the victorious Christian Carolingian ruler we have here its logical opposite, the image of the dead Christian Carolingian ruler mourned by his people. It is precisely *because* this ruler was so successful that his death is mourned with such intensity.

There are no poems securely attributable to the reigns of Bernard [see below for his dubious epitaph] or Lothar I: although Lothar was the recipient of many verse works, none can be definitely stated to be the product of Italian poets or to have been produced during his stay in Italy or even to have been known in Italy, except the works of Sedulius considered below. However, from the mid-ninth century, two poems with an urban focus also draw in the Carolingians, although (in much the same way as the *Versus de Verona*) only incidentally. The verses on the destruction of Aquileia *numquam restaurandae*, perhaps by the patriarch Paulinus⁹⁷, are a vivid account of the fifth-century destruction of the city by the Huns and in conclusion, a meditative comment on the city's decline and current status.⁹⁸ These verses appear to have triggered somewhat later the production of the *Carmen de Aquileia*⁹⁹ which concludes with the reign of the patriarch Maxentius (Paulinus's successor), to whom the poem is inveterately hostile. Maxentius appealed unsuccessfully to Charlemagne to restore Aquileia to its former glory. Maxentius appears to have taken this task seriously since he was probably responsible for a certain amount of restoration work in Aquileia's cathedral and for the construction of the so-called *Chiesa dei Pagani*, linking the baptistery to the main body of the cathedral.¹⁰⁰ However Lothar I and Louis II did not

⁹⁵V. 8.

⁹⁶Vv. 3 *Franci, Romani atque cuncti creduli luctu punguntur et magna molestia; vv. 15-16 dies...clara non adduxit lumina...quae cuncti orbis christiano populo / vexit ad mortem venerandum principem.*

⁹⁷D. Norberg, *L'Oeuvre Poétique de Paulin d'Aquileé* (1979), pp. 12-13; text at 166-9; Godman, *Poetry*, pp. 28-9; Zanna, 'Descriptiones', pp. 524-5.

⁹⁸Zanna, 'Descriptiones', pp. 525-31.

⁹⁹A. De Nicola, 'I Versi Sulla Distruzione di Aquileia', *Studi Goriziani* 50 (1979), pp. 7-31; most recent edition in catalogue for exhibition, ed. S. Blason Carel, *Attila e gli Unni* (Rome 1995), IIIa, pp. 95-8.

¹⁰⁰C. G. Mor, 'La Cultura Aquileiese nei Secoli IX-XI', *SCultura Veneta* I, p. 288.

reconstruct the city of Aquileia. According to the later poet this was because they were possessed by *zelum dei*, for Aquileia had been destroyed by divine judgment. This is clearly a literalist development of the theme of Paulinus's poem; Aquileia had been rightly destroyed, its restoration would be a mistake. The *carmen de Aquileia* was therefore intended to praise and reinforce the decision of the emperors not to restore Aquileia - perhaps meaning the transfer of the patriarchate from its ninth-century seat at Cividale¹⁰¹ back to Aquileia. The poem's hostility to this return to the ancient seat of the Patriarchate has led to the poem being attributed to Grado or Venice,¹⁰² although a Cividale writer might have been hostile to such a move too. The intense regional rivalry in the poem is made explicit in the last verse: *Gloriosa deitatis unitatis trinitatis, fac devincere fallaces Aquilegienses nos...* The Carolingian rulers are praised in this work because their (in)action coincides with local ambitions. It is again striking how, as with the Verona/Milan example, the Carolingians are introduced into local poetic rivalries, but remain peripheral.

In the mid-ninth century Sedulius Scottus wrote a poem about one of Louis II's Arab campaigns.¹⁰³ This work has only relatively recently been divorced from the poem to Lothar I which preceded it in the manuscript (and with which it was contiguous) because the two poems have different verse structures and nowhere else does Sedulius change rhythmic scheme mid-verse.¹⁰⁴ Exactly which campaign is meant is unclear, probably that of 846. The poem praises Louis's Arab wars, dramatically contrasting the Franks, all of whose qualities are positive, and the Arabs, all of whose qualities are negative. Thus the Franks are a *cignea turba*, they sing *alleluiatica verba* and hymns, whereas the *corvina phalanx* of Arabs *rustica verba dedit*. The Saracens

¹⁰¹On Cividale as the Patriarch's seat: H. Schmidinger, 'Die Besetzung des Patriarchenstuhls von Aquileja bis zur Mitte des 13 Jahrhunderts', *Patriarch im Abendland. Beiträge zur Geschichte des Papsttums, Roms und Aquileias im Mittelalter*, eds. H. Dopsch, H. Koller, P. F. Krammel, (Salzburg, 1986), pp. 277-96 at 284. [orig. publ. in *MIÖG* 50 (1964)]

¹⁰²De Nicola, *Attila*, p. 95.

¹⁰³*MGH PLAC* III, no. xxv, pp. 191-2, ll. 19f.

¹⁰⁴R. Düchting, *Sedulius Scottus. Seine Dichtungen* (1968, Munich), pp. 98-100; now followed by I. Meyers, *Sedulii Scotti Carmina*, (Corpus Christianorum Continuatio Medievalis CXVII- 1991), no. 25, pp. 48-9, 149; E. G. Doyle, *Sedulius Scottus on Christian Rulers*, (New York, 1983), notes on p. 185.

were wolves, the Franks the chosen ones of St. Peter led by Louis II.¹⁰⁵ The Franks are called *Christicola*.

Italy and Rome are to exult in this triumph, for Sedulius tells Louis, perhaps in an oblique reference to *laudes regiae, murus eras populo*.¹⁰⁶ However it is difficult to argue that this phrase had much influence in Italy; almost the only *laudes* not to use the *murus noster inexpugnabilis* phrase are those of Louis II from Chieti. Again although the topos of victory over the Saracens and St. Peter's support are important here, it is equally true to say that little else in the poem seems to find much echo in other Italian poems.

The poem lamenting the imprisonment of Louis II in Benevento is another which survives in Verona Cod. XC. It is an *abecedarius*, like so many of the other poems in that collection. Its clearly Christomimetic approach to the subject (emperor/Christ parallels) has often been commented upon.¹⁰⁷ This is not unique amongst texts referring to Louis II. Erchempert calls Louis *vir sanctissimus* and *salvator provinciae beneventanae* because of his attacks on the Arabs (although Erchempert also justifies Louis's incarceration in the terms of divine justice¹⁰⁸). The poem has sometimes been thought to come from Louis's court¹⁰⁹ but again there is no direct proof of this beyond the poem's subject matter, which is certainly pro-imperial. Given the common use of the *abecedarius* form in other poems in Verona XC (there are eight others¹¹⁰), especially the use of the opening phrase *audite omnes* (possibly derived from a hymn¹¹¹) there are no compelling grounds for assuming the poem had anything more to do with the court than other verses in the manuscript. Indeed the evidence of Erchempert's description of the emperor shows that even in places well-outside the

¹⁰⁵Lines 29-34, 41, 61-3; Düchting, *Sedulius*, pp. 99-100.

¹⁰⁶Cf. the acclamation *murus noster inexpugnabilis*, present in most *laudes*, including those from Verona Cod. XII, fol. 67v, 69v [partly damaged]; Meerssemann, J. Deshusses, Adda eds., *L'Orazionale dell'Arcidiacono Pacifico*, (Spicilegium Friburgense, 1973), pp.188-9; cf. B. Opfermann, *Herrscherakklamation*, pp. 107, 110, 115, 117.

¹⁰⁷Szövérfy, *Weltliche Dichtungen*, p. 682.

¹⁰⁸Erchempert c. 34, p. 247; Taviani-Carozzi, *Salerno*, p. 59.

¹⁰⁹G. Chiri, *Poesia Cortese Latina (Profilo Storico dal V al XII Secolo)*, (Rome, 1954), p. 70.

¹¹⁰Meerssemann, 'Codice XC', nos. 2, 9, 24, 31, 35, 43, 48, 50, pp. 14, 15, 17-19.

¹¹¹Ebenbauer, *Carmen Historicum*, p. 33. Precisely because the poem is modelled on a hymn it seems impossible to prove it was intended for performance - it may only reproduce the hymn's verse form.

regnum italiae (and even years after his death¹¹²) Louis left an impression of at least official piety. The emperor is referred to as *sanctus pius Augustus* or variations on this phrase.¹¹³ The Christomimetic topos of the poem is certainly stronger than Erchempert's phrases but that they differ in degree rather than kind is I think evident.

This parallel has not been noted in the only substantial study of the verse by Russo-Mailler, who has suggested that the poem is a popular work from southern Italy¹¹⁴ - a view I find untenable. Russo-Mailler's argument that the poem's grammar is more like the spoken language of south Italy seems to me unprovable (what is the evidence for comparison?), especially since she acknowledges that the grammar and language of the poem are quite unlike those of southern Italian historians like Erchempert - if anything a strong argument against a southern origin. Nor does she explain how, uniquely, such a southern work found its way into a north Italian manuscript. In short none of these arguments support her conclusion that the poem was probably the product of 'un chierico con l'anima di un giullare, di formazione culturale assai modesto al seguito del imperatore'.¹¹⁵ The traditional Veronese origin remains much likelier.

Louis is presented as a Christ-figure betrayed by the Beneventans, and his treatment is likened to that of Christ by the high priests in Jerusalem.¹¹⁶ In an echo of the Gospels, the Beneventans come armed with *gladiis et frustes* [sic], like those who arrested Christ with swords and clubs.¹¹⁷ The fear expressed by the Beneventan princes is that Louis will deprive them of their *regnum* (...*regnum nostris nobis tollit*...).¹¹⁸ They conclude that it is right he should die (*rectum est ut moriatur*). Louis presents himself as a martyr (*ille vero gade visum tamquam ad martirium*) uncomprehending of the cause of their hostility (*nescio pro quid causam vultis me occidere*). All of this is characterized in the opening line of the poem as *errore cum tristitia*.¹¹⁹ In v. 8 this

¹¹²Erchempert wrote c. 889-90: Taviani-Carozzi, *Salerno*, p. 52.

¹¹³MGH PLAC IV p. 404: v. 1; cf. v. 4: *deposuerunt sancto pio*; v. 5 *ipse sancte pio*;

¹¹⁴Russo-Mailler, 'Politica', *passim*, esp. 17f.

¹¹⁵Russo-Mailler, 'Politica', pp. 19-20. Usefully, however, she does offer variant readings of some phrases from her reading of the manuscript.

¹¹⁶Szövérfy, *Weltliche Dichtungen*, p. 682.

¹¹⁷Cf. esp. Mat. 27, 47; Mark 14, 43.

¹¹⁸Cf. *Annales Bertiniani* a. 871, p. 118 which has a similar suggestion.

¹¹⁹Russo-Mailler, 'Politica', p. 18 suggests the opening word may in fact be *errore*.

culminates when the un-named *temptator* (presumably Adelchis) places the crown on his own head and presumes to claim to the *populus*: *ecce sumus imperator, possum vobis regere*. However his sins multiply because this impostor had an *animus letus de illo quo fecerat* and he is struck down because of his effrontery (*a demonio vexatur ad terram ceciderat*).¹²⁰ Christ 'judged the judgement' and many Saracens left Calabria to take possession of Salerno. This punishment clearly fell on the city as a result of the 'sad error' described in the poem.

The manuscript tradition of the Italian poems concerning the Carolingians is of great importance. The *Versus de Verona*, the Columbanus lament and the Louis II *Rhythmus* are all preserved only in Verona Cod. XC. This manuscript contains more than 70 poems, written in about thirty hands of very variable quality. The codex appears to have no systematic structure. It has therefore been argued that Verona XC, produced in the early tenth century, is just a compilation of poems circulating in Verona (or even just in the manuscript's scriptorium), probably used (as the wide variation in script quality suggests) as test- and teaching pieces¹²¹. With regard to the Louis II *rhythmus* I have already drawn attention to the fact that so many of the other poems in this collection are *abecedarii* - which might be an ideal form for encouraging linguistic competence. (Note also that the model for the Verona poem, the *Versus Mediolanensis*, is one of these *abecedarii* preserved in Verona Cod. XC.¹²²) This strongly suggests the importance of the scholastic environment¹²³ for the production and preservation of such poems. Likewise the Avar poem is preserved in the late

¹²⁰Cf. *Vita Athanasii*, MGH SS RL p. 448 where it is, somewhat differently, the devil who *inspires* the evil action against Louis rather than punishing the evil-doers. Cf above ch. 3.

¹²¹For all this see Meersseman, 'Codice XC', pp. 11-14; collection of rebound test-pieces suggested by Marchi, 'Versus', pp. 261-2; Marchi's palaeographical comments concerning the codex are independently confirmed by P. Bourgain, 'Les recueils Carolingiens de Poésie Rythmique', *De Tertullien aux Mozarabes t.II Antiquité Tardive et Christianisme Ancien (VI-IX siècles)*. Mélanges offerts à Jacques Fontaine..., (Collection des Études Augustiniennes série Moyen-âge et temps Moderne 26; Paris, 1992), pp. 117-27 at 123-4. For a parallel with Lucca, Biblioteca Capitolare Q. VIII: A. Petrucci, 'Literacy and Graphic Culture of Early Medieval Scribes', *Writers and Readers in Medieval Italy*, trans. C. M. Radding, (Yale, 1995) p. 92.

¹²²Meersseman, 'Codice XC', p. 15; G. Polara, *Letteratura Latina Tardoantica e Altomedievale* (Rome, 1987), p. 216.

¹²³Although confusingly Bourgain, 'Recueils', p. 124 states that 'rien n'est grammatical ni scolaire dans ce manuscrit', [my italics] despite his comments on 123-4 about the shortcomings of the scribes and his description of them as 'apprentice canons' ! I therefore interpret 'scolaire' to mean 'scholarly'.

eighth-century manuscript Berlin Diez. B. 66, another teaching manuscript containing ancient grammars as well as a number of poems.¹²⁴ Only the verses by the named authors Angilbert and Sedulius are preserved outside such a scholastic manuscript context. One recalls, in juxtaposition, the emphasis in the 825 capitulary on schools and teaching. There are other congruences. The topics of the poems in the Verona manuscript are almost exclusively theological. The only exceptions are precisely those poems about the Carolingians. (There is nothing comparable, for example, to Walafrid's poem about his garden or Theodulf's on the corruption of judges.) Whether this represents those subjects it was acceptable to write about, or those subjects selected for compilation in the manuscript, or blind chance, it does show, at least, that the Carolingians were the subject of poems. They were thought to be worth writing about. Given the scholastic environment in which these poems were produced and the relatively narrow range of verse forms used for them, one wonders whether recent events concerning the Carolingians (such as the Avar war, Charlemagne's death, or Louis II's imprisonment) might have been set as subjects for poetic composition by students.

I have indicated in passing that the language of all those poems dealing with the Carolingian rulers is almost always drawn from other fields - for the Verona poem liturgy, for the Louis II poem Scripture, for the Avar poem law. No accepted vocabulary of kingship was deployed. I therefore suggest that no such shared language existed. Italian poets wrote about the Carolingians with such linguistic tools as came to hand. By this I mean that there was no accepted vocabulary for poets to approach the Carolingians. If it is correct to attribute a scholastic origin to many of these poems perhaps one should not expect a common vocabulary. On the contrary each poem might be an extemporization on the theme. There are some exceptions to this linguistic isolation. It is possible (although unprovable) that the lines *Principe cum tanto plebe, clerus, ara, sacerdos / Adventus vestri gaudia magna metunt*, and *...quidve duces*,

¹²⁴B. Bischoff, 'Frühkarolingische Handschriften', p. 307 gives 'Austrasia' as the manuscript's origin; id. *Diez. B. 66*, p. 21f. ; *ibid.* (*Corpus Christianorum. Series Latina CXXXIII D*), (Turnhout, 1992), p. XII; Ebenbauer, *Carmen Historicum*, p. 248 n.

comites, quid puer atque senes ? from Angilbert's poem¹²⁵ influenced one from the Columbanus lament (*infantes senes, gloriosi praesules, matronae plangunt detrimentum Caesaris*). However the topos is such an obvious one (society conceived of as the composite of its constituent units) and the lines sufficiently different to cause one to question whether any real relationship underlies their similarity. They do however emphasize Carolingian claims to rule the whole of society, comparable in some respects to the breadth of concerns dealt with in capitularies, and they show society's at least supposed interest in their doings.

Epitaphs: Given my conclusions and the necessity of discussing their manuscript traditions I have left epitaphs until last. They appear to be entirely independent of the poems I have discussed above. There are several epitaphs from Italy about the Carolingians. An epitaph engraved on a large tomb slab has been discovered for Bernard, but it was only excavated in the sixteenth century and must be regarded as highly dubious.¹²⁶ Possibly it was modelled on Louis II's authentic surviving stone epitaph. Likewise two epitaphs of Pippin survive: one, of only two lines, was excavated from beneath the floor of the choir of S. Ambrogio in Milan in 1874 and its authenticity has been widely-questioned,¹²⁷ the other survives in a manuscript.¹²⁸ This epitaph, traditionally attributed to Dungal,¹²⁹ is preserved in Vatican Reg. Lat. 2078; the manuscript is believed to have been written in Rheims in the first quarter of the ninth century¹³⁰ by 'Hibernicus Exul', sometimes identified as Dungal,¹³¹ who may have brought the manuscript to Italy¹³² where he taught in Pavia from 825 [see above]. It is

¹²⁵Here *MGH PLAC* I, p. 358, ll. 7-8 & p. 360, l. 58.

¹²⁶N. Gray, *The Palaeography of Latin Inscriptions in the Eighth, Ninth and Tenth Centuries in Italy*, (British School at Rome, 1948), p. 90, no. 6 regards it as 'epigraphically...convincing'; which only makes it early rather than authentic; cf. Picard, *Souvenir*, p. 94 n. 268.

¹²⁷E. Besta, *SMilano* II, p. 355 with full earlier refs.; illus. 357: text: *Hic Pipinus rex quiescit in pace qui in hac regnavit provincia [sic] an. XXVIII . M. IIII. DL positus V. id. Iul. in dictione IIII fil D. M. CAROLI*. Gray, *Palaeography*, p. 89, no. 59.

¹²⁸*MGH PLAC* I p. 405, no. XV.

¹²⁹Bezzola, *Littérature*, I, p. 129 n. 1.

¹³⁰Bischoff, *Scriptorium* 22 (1968), p. 314; S. Gavinelli, 'Per un'Enciclopedia Carolingia (Codice Bergense 363)', *IMU* XXVI (1983), pp. 1-26, at 5; G. Bernt, *Das Lateinische Epigramm im Übergang von der Spätantike zum frühen Mittelalter*, (Münchener Beiträge zur Mediävistik und Renaissance Forschung 2 - 1968) p. 228 more cautiously gives the first third of the ninth century.

¹³¹Duemmler, *MGH PLAC* I pp. 390-2; Bernt, *Epigramm*, p. 228 & n. 221.

¹³²Gavinelli, 'Enciclopedia', pp. 5-6.

a 'complex poetic miscellany' related in still only partly understood ways to Milan Ambrosiana C. 74.¹³³ It has long been acknowledged that not all of these verses were by Dungal (or 'Hibernicus Exul'), although Duemmler, Traube and more recently Bernt have all been unable to concur on which poems were Dungal's.¹³⁴ Traube suggested poems nos. VI-VII and XII-XVIII (including Pippin's epitaph) were from a St. Denis exemplar, which would do little to comfort Dungal's authorship.¹³⁵ Moreover the Vat. Reg. Lat. 2078 manuscript itself does not seem to be in Dungal's own hand, nor does 2078 contain those alterations to the text of Prudentius's *Psychomachia* which Ferrari has identified as Dungal's in Milan, Ambrosiana D. 36. Ferrari, although keen to establish a link between Vat. Reg. Lat. 2078 and the Irish scholar, is unwilling to go further than to claim that, 'la formazione [of 2078] forse Dungal non fu estraneo'.¹³⁶ The section of the manuscript containing Pippin's epitaph also records others and is, according to Ferrari, 'un esempio del gusto allora invalso per i carmi lapidari autentici o d'imitazione',¹³⁷ which does not advance our understanding much further. The precise context of the authorship of Pippin's epitaph is therefore extremely difficult to establish. At the very least the unannotated text of the *Psychomachia* in Vat. Reg. Lat. 2078 suggests that it must have been written before Ambrosiana D. 36. At worst it means that the Dungal association assumed by the *MGH* editor is quite wrong which would be a blow to its 'Italian' context. The preservation of Pippin's epitaph amongst a series of others also raises the possibility that this is not the king's authentic tomb inscription but rather a poetic tribute to him cast in epitaph form. This would make it very difficult indeed to establish the epitaph's audience.

However given that the text has been associated with Italy in the early ninth century it seems worthwhile considering it. The epitaph is of twenty lines. The syllable scheme is again somewhat irregular but appears ideally to be alternating sixteen- and fourteen-

¹³³Ferrari, 'In Papia', pp. 37-9.

¹³⁴Duemmler *MGH PLAC I*, pp. 390-4; L. Traube, 'O Roma Nobilis!' *Philologische Untersuchungen aus dem Mittelalter, Abhandlungen der philos.-philolog. Klasse der kgl. Bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften*, 19 (1892), pp. 299-395 at 332-7; Bernt, *Epigramm*, pp. 228-37, esp. here 229-34.

¹³⁵Traube, 'Roma', p. 334.

¹³⁶Ferrari, 'In Papia', pp. 46, 41f., quotation from 52.

¹³⁷Ferrari, 'In Papia', pp. 5-6.

syllable lines.¹³⁸ Immediately apparent is the poet's use of echoing distichs. The work is strongly laudatory but the use of the echoing distichs also give it a meditative tone: Pippin was *rex venerandus* but now lies in the tomb (*Pipinus, rex venerandus, Hesperiam rexit, hoc iacet in tumulo*). His lineage, his whiter-than-lily-white skin¹³⁹ and more generally his many virtues are praised (*pulcher, nobilior meritis*); he had a great love for his people, and *virtus*, and he provided peace. He was *rex bonus et placidus*, second to none in goodness.

The epitaph's use of phrases from verses by Venantius Fortunatus (in common with many other Carolingian poems¹⁴⁰) was signalled by Duemmler in his notes. He identified, in my opinion correctly, four lines more or less obviously modelled on Venantian phrases. However, Duemmler may have erred on the side of caution. I believe there are at least two other phrases derived from Venantius, indeed from the same verses Duemmler himself indicated for other images in the epitaph. I would add: epit. l. 1-2 (*hoc iacet in tumulo Pippinus, rex venerandus, Hesperiam rexit, hoc iacet in tumulo*) has affinities to Venantius's epitaph for Leontius bishop of Bordeaux: *hoc recubant tumulo venerandi membra Leonti, quo stetit eximium pontificale caput*,¹⁴¹ and from the epitaph for Arachari *ipse palatina refulsit clarus in aula et placido meruit regis amore coli*¹⁴² influencing epitaph's *fulsit clara dies deque sua facie* and also possibly the description of Pippin as *placidus*.¹⁴³ Clearly both these examples provide linguistic influences rather than the straight borrowing of a line which

¹³⁸The line-by-line syllable count is as follows: 15, 13, 16, 14, 15, 14, 16, 14, 16, 13, 16, 13, 15, 12, 16, 14, 17, 15, 16, 6 [incomplete line]. Some of these irregularities can be resolved. Note if in the 2 opening lines *iacet* is pronounced with two vowel sounds instead of the *ia* diphthong it conforms precisely to the 16-14 scheme: *hoc iacet in tumulo Pippinus, rex venerandus / Hesperiam rexit, hoc iacet in tumulo*. Likewise if in the penultimate l. 18 the opening two syllables of *suavia* are elided (as in modern English and French) to *suavià* the line has fourteen syllables.

¹³⁹F. Manacorda, *Ricerche Sugli Inizi della Dominazione dei Carolingi in Italia*, (Rome, 1968), p. 25 suggest this whiteness was an element of Frankish ethnic beauty.

¹⁴⁰Godman, *Poets*, pp. 38, 45, 49.

¹⁴¹MGH *Venantius Fortunatus*, ed. F. Leo (Berlin, 1881), IV, no. IX, p. 85, ll. 3-4.; cf. Duemmler n. 7.

¹⁴²MGH *Venantius* ed. Leo, IV, no. XVIX, p. 92, l.5; cf. Duemmler n. 9

¹⁴³Duemmler n. 6 indicated the influence of Venantius IV, VIII, p. 84-5, ll. 12 *nobilior merito* used in the epitaph but did not signal the following line: *sic vultu semper placidus*...which again I would suggest as an influence on the epitaph poet (who called Pippin *bonus et placidus*), particularly as these Venantius verses are clearly at the back of the ninth-century poet's mind.

Duemmler concentrated upon. But if I am correct they only further reinforce the importance of Venantius's poetry to the author of Pippin's epitaph. Closer scrutiny of other Venantian verses might reveal more similarities. Conversely, one would note however that none of the poems indicated by Duemmler were *royal* epitaphs. The author of Pippin's epitaph was not therefore aligning Pippin with Venantius's Merovingian patrons; the borrowings are only stylistic.

There also survive epitaphs for two of Pippin's daughters, Rothaid and Adelaide.¹⁴⁴ Adelaide died in 810 when she was about twelve.¹⁴⁵ Both verses have been dubiously attributed to Paul the Deacon but the issue is far from certain,¹⁴⁶ particularly considering their late date, since Paul would have been at least eighty. The epitaphs are believed to be linked to the girls's graves in the Arnulf chapel in Metz¹⁴⁷ which must raise questions concerning the knowledge of these epitaphs in Italy. Moreover the verses have almost nothing in common. Rothaid's lays strong emphasis on her Carolingian parentage: *Pippinus pater est, Karolo de principe cretus*, on their Trojan origin (*abavus Anschisa potens, qui ducit ab illo Troiano Anschisa longo post tempore nomen.*), on the military achievements of her father: [Pippin] *Aggarenum stravit magna*, and finally on Saint Arnulf, the family holy man (*Hunc [Anschis] gemuit pater iste sacer presulque beatus Arnulfus*). In this regard the reference to her *gentes* who *subdidit armis Ausonias* may be her family rather than just a generic reference to the Franks. Adelaide's epitaph is very different. It considers the other tombs in the Arnulf chapel and does not even name her until the last line¹⁴⁸, where she is described as *Pippini... proles Adelheid pia virgo*. But this single reference seems insufficient to support the idea that it is a variation on her sister's epitaph. The emphasis in this poem is on the numerous other famous tombs in the chapel (*cur busta sacer numerosa retentet / hic locus...?*), and presumably by way of consolation, on the appropriateness of the daughter's death before that of the father, rendered here as her germination or

¹⁴⁴MGH PLAC I, nos. XX, XXI pp. 57-8; Bernt, *Epigramm*, p. 192.

¹⁴⁵Nelson, 'Famille', genealogy pp. 210-11.

¹⁴⁶Bernt, *Epigramm*, p. 190.

¹⁴⁷MGH PLAC I, Duemmler notes [XX], p. 57.

¹⁴⁸Bernt, *Epigramm*, p. 192 n. 13.

flowering: *legitimi fuerat germinis ante pater*. He can be certain that she, who would have lost her protector, will now rest here: *cuius posteritas atavo confisa patrono, /Hoc cupit in sancto ponere membra loco*. Both epitaphs obviously do lay emphasis on parentage but Rothaid's does so in a much more dynastic sense. Adelheid's epitaph is far more oblique, perhaps reflecting the fact that she was young and had yet to enter public life. However the emphasis on the surroundings of her tomb, if it is the Metz chapel (which is not explicitly stated in the poem) obviously does have dynastic overtones. The major stress, however, lies on her father rather than her illustrious lineage. The verse seems more to reflect parental loss than dynasticism.

Lastly there is Louis II's epitaph,¹⁴⁹ which still survives in S. Ambrogio, on a magnificently engraved slab. There was some near-contemporary interest in the lines because they were copied in Paris BN 7972 probably from Milan of the early tenth century.¹⁵⁰ Louis is called *caesar*. The explicitly inherited (dynastic ? although no other names are included in the epitaph) nature of his rule was affirmed: *Hesperius...reliquit avus*. But the personal nature of his rule (in this case presented as rule alone) was also stressed in this account and the achievements of his reign, which swiftly exceeded those of the older generation (*puerum brevitatis vinceret acta senem*). His imperial title derived from Rome whom he freed from the 'crowds of Saracens' (*Imperii nomen subdita Roma dedit / et Saracenorum crebras perpessa secures/ libera tranquillam vixit*). Now unhappy Rome, Latium and 'Gallia' mourn. Clearly here the emphasis is on Louis's 'imperial' title rather than on the Italian nature of his rule. His epitaph is couched in the broadest terms possible, as an authentic emperor of the West. There may be echoes here of Anastasius's letter.

Note that epitaphs could be used for powerful display purposes - for example the famous and magnificent black marble slab epitaph for pope Hadrian I provided by

¹⁴⁹Gray, *Palaeography*, p. 93 no. 67, pl. XVII, 4.

¹⁵⁰MGH PLAC III ed. L. Traube, p. 403; Besta, *SMilano* II, pp. 409-10.

Charlemagne and written by Alcuin still displayed in St. Peter's today.¹⁵¹ Such prominent displays did not go unnoticed: an inscription over Charlemagne's tomb is referred to in the Columban *planctus*.¹⁵² Even if the poet wrote from the expectation that such an inscription would be provided, rather than from the knowledge of the inscription itself¹⁵³ it still shows that such inscriptions could have a high public profile. In Italy itself Agnellus of Ravenna constructed much of his history from just such public inscriptions.¹⁵⁴ The epitaph slab for Louis II shows that this tradition survived until the end of the Carolingian era.

Audiences: I would like to offer some broader concluding comments. Angilbert's poem has been characterized as a greetings verse, perhaps even delivered to Pippin's face.¹⁵⁵ If this is correct (which is also unprovable) it might permit us to discern a public arena in Pippin's court, particularly in combination with the suggestion that the Avar verses were to be sung.¹⁵⁶ Regrettably, as I have indicated, this must remain conjectural because we cannot know if either the Avar poem or Angilbert's poem really *were* intended to be presented 'live' at court, and because the credentials of the Avar poem as 'court' verse are suspect.

One can find congruences between these verses. Note the preference in Angilbert's poem and the epitaphs of Pippin and Louis II for describing the peninsula by the literary term *Hesperius* rather than *Italia* (both have the same syllable count so the preference cannot be shaped by the demands of metre); the repeated topos of the *populus* united by their rulers; the emphasis on the Carolingians as victorious Christian

¹⁵¹A. Petrucci, 'Symbolic Aspects of Written Evidence', *Writers* trans. Radding, pp. 103-31, esp. 106-9 on the origins of the letter forms for the epitaph. Possibly the type of script used for the epitaph was part of its prestige.

¹⁵²MGH PLAC I, p. 435, v. 9: *...iam serenus Karolum / telluris tegit titulatus tumulus*.

¹⁵³As Godman in my opinion perhaps misleadingly implies in *Poetry*, p. 209 n., by footnoting H. Beumann's study of Charlemagne's epitaph in *Karl der Grosse* IV, p. 13. I do not think that the 'Columbanus' poet refers specifically to the *actual* tomb inscription but rather generically to a tomb and inscription as a spur to mourning for the emperor. The line is also obviously built around assonant use of the 't' sound suggesting that the accuracy of the information in this strophe is secondary to the poet's literary objectives. In short poets rework their material even more radically than other writers and cannot be taken at face value.

¹⁵⁴See Pizarro, *Writing Ravenna*, pp. 84-6.

¹⁵⁵Schaller, 'Angilbert', *Verfasserlexikon*, I, col. 362.

¹⁵⁶See above.

rulers and on the Carolingians as a family. However none of these topoi are repeated either so insistently or in so original a fashion that one can claim to see direct links between their use in different works. As I have tried to show above, the manuscript tradition provides little support for the idea of a common culture. In this I am sceptical of Godman's vision of an Italian court under Pippin which seems too influenced by his model of Charlemagne's court. Only the *Versus de Verona* can be confidently attributed to Verona; there is tangential support for the hypothesis (no more) that the Avar verses originated there. Even so this does not prove a court origin; these verses might have come from the local school.

Underlying the supposed importance of Verona is the assumption that literary works had political importance and so their production should be associated with political centres, as was often the case in West Frankia. In Italy this is questionable. Pavia clearly remained the major governmental centre after 774 yet we know of no literary productions definitely from that city. Many of the Italian works discussed above are attributed to Verona in the belief that Pippin's court was there. But even the evidence for this is not compelling; it is only directly supported by a single line in the *Versus de Verona*. Pippin was admittedly involved in the restoration of S. Zeno,¹⁵⁷ which shows his involvement with the town but Verona was clearly not the only such centre. Political power was not, as in Lombard Pavia before 774, necessarily concentrated at one place; under the Carolingians other centres were certainly politically important. Mantua possessed a royal palace by 813¹⁵⁸ and was occasionally used for assemblies or synods.¹⁵⁹ Although this use is only demonstrable after 813¹⁶⁰ it seems likely that Mantua fulfilled such a role earlier. Around 803 Mantua's status was upgraded to a bishopric, the action supposedly triggered by the discovery of a relic of

¹⁵⁷S. Zeno. *La Cattedrale di Verona*, ed. P. Brugnoli, (Venice, 1987), p. 82.

¹⁵⁸MGH Cap. I nos. 92-3 pp. 194-8 were issued there *in palatio regio*.

¹⁵⁹In 827 Mantua hosted the synod to decide patriarchal claims between Grado and Aquileia: MGH *Concilia* II, no. 47, pp. 583-9; G. De Vergottini, 'Venezia e l'Istria nell'Alto Medio Evo', *SCiviltà Veneziana* I, (Florence, 1979, 2nd edn.) pp. 74-5; Brunelli, *Diocesi di Mantova*, p. 20.

¹⁶⁰I date the existence of the palace no earlier than 813 because caps. no. 92-3 have been redated to 813; Manacorda, *Ricerche*, p. with refs.; cf below ch. VI. The introductory comment in MGH Cap. I no. 90, p. 190, ll. 9-10 (a.781) (cf. Manacorda, *Ricerche*, p. 48) does not refer to a palace but is early evidence of Carolingian 'decentralization'.

Holy Blood; Charlemagne is explicitly recorded requesting Leo III's involvement.¹⁶¹ Further evidence of Mantua's significance is in a fairly well-informed early eleventh-century Venetian source, which (reporting events which probably took place between 803-10) claims that doge John fled to Mantua, presumably to seek Pippin's aid.¹⁶² Later in the 820s Lothar issued many charters at rural sites.¹⁶³ This is all most unlike Lombard kings whose government activity was always carried out in Pavia. In the absence of any other evidence, if there is no political centre there is no particular reason to associate cultural endeavour with one place either. The picture of decentralized Italian literary production therefore actually mirrors that of Italian political centres in the Carolingian period. Hence the assumption that the production of poetic works about the Carolingians was linked to political centres, much less a single political centre reprising the centralized nature of the early medieval Italian state, does not survive scrutiny. If one thus abandons the models which since the last century have sustained the hypothesis of a political context for Carolingian poetry one is left with a handful of almost isolated scraps in Italy. Godman's 'experimental' poetry of the late eighth century and the claim that 'Verona, [was] the chief centre of rhythmical verse in the north of that [Lombard] kingdom'¹⁶⁴ dissolve. One would note that Verona has few rivals as a centre for the production of poetry in early Carolingian Italy not least because there is little evidence from anywhere else. This fact has been insufficiently emphasized.

The centralized view of Carolingian poetic production has also influenced the interpretation of the poems' audience. Godman has perceived linguistic variation in the Avar verses: the 'vulgarisms' which stud the text are not, he claims, 'marks of ignorance

¹⁶¹*Annales Regni Francorum* a. 804, pp. 119; the best recent account of the relic's discovery is Brunelli, *DMantova*, pp. 15-17 with refs., who is however unaware of the political implications.

¹⁶²Giovanni Diacono, *Cronaca Veneziana*, (FSI 55; Rome, 1920), p. 101, ll.10-12; cf. ed. G. Coniglio, *Mantova: La Storia*, I (Mantua, 1958) p. 71.

¹⁶³*Die Urkunden Lothars I und II*, ed. T. Schieffer, nos. 1-8, pp. 42f.

¹⁶⁴Godman, *Poetry*, p. 31. Godman cites Norberg, *La Poésie latine rythmique du haut moyen-âge* (Stockholm, 1954), to support these claims: but it is not Norberg who places these poems into a political context however but Godman himself. Norberg only suggests a link between the authorship of a verse *vita* of St. Zeno (*MGH PLAC* IV ed. Strecker, no. LI, pp. 577-80) and the translation of the saint's relics when the cathedral was rebuilt under Pippin. I would note that this *vita* poem is yet another *abecedarius* and hence fits my model.

but the sign of a cultivated author's conscious attempt to compose a Latin intelligible to fellow clerics';¹⁶⁵ developing from this McKitterick has argued that in fact perhaps a lay audience was intended, stressing 'the very sense that the poet is writing down to his audience'.¹⁶⁶ If correct this would be potentially very important for the works' audience. However since the Avar verses probably come from Verona I would suggest an alternative geo-linguistic explanation. A version of vulgar Latin was undoubtedly the spoken tongue of early medieval Italy. Modern criticism of the Latinity of even clerical writers such as Andreas of Bergamo has only very recently begun to take this into account. Underlying Godman and especially McKitterick's views, despite the differences between them, is an assumption that the quality of latinity reflected both education and social status - in other words that educated clerics would not write 'vulgar' Latin. The evidence of Italian texts does not support this. Senior Italian ecclesiastical writers did not write like Einhard or Paschasius.¹⁶⁷ Significantly writers such as these latter two came from Germanic-speaking areas of the Carolingian empire and learned Latin as a second language. Hence rather than hypothesizing social stratification to explain linguistic variation it seems much simpler to argue that the Avar poem was written in an environment where some version of Latin was still a living language but that this version of the language was not classically correct. The 'vulgarisms' of the poem are therefore not reflections of social status (nor even perhaps except in a limited sense of education) but only of the poem's geographical origin. The language of the verse is not therefore helpful in assessing its audience, at least not from the perspective of that audience's social composition.

The geographical origin of the verses is significant in other respects. The representations of the Carolingians found in Italian literary culture treated them as the background to local rivalries (*Versus de Verona*, *Carmen de Aquileia*). In these works

¹⁶⁵Godman, *Poetry*, p. 31.

¹⁶⁶McKitterick, *Written Word*, pp. 227-32, esp. 229-31.

¹⁶⁷Philological studies are available for enough of the Italian writers to demonstrate their diversity: Andreas: Bethmann, 'Sprachgebrauch' pp. 659-72; Agnellus: S. Lazard, 'De l'Origine des hellénismes d'Agnello', *Revue linguistique romane* 40 (1976), pp. 255-98; Pizarro, 'Writing Ravenna', p. 23 & n. 42; on Rambert of Brescia: Betelli Bergamaschi, 'Ramperto', pp. 84-93, esp. 84-88.

no details are included to differentiate between Carolingians, or between Carolingians and other rulers. The Carolingians are almost abstract personifications of authority or power. Towns associated with them enjoyed reflected glory. The Carolingians are thus represented as powerful rulers. The subtlety of their ideology even as expressed in the capitularies is entirely absent.

Later poems, particularly the two concerned with Louis II (Sedulius's verse and the *Rythmus de Ludovico*) have a noticeably more Christian approach to the emperor than those referring to Pippin or Lothar but this may reflect more Louis's well-known exploits against the Arabs than any shift in perception of the Carolingians. Moreover neither of these poems is typical and generalizing from them is probably unsafe. There seems to be little common ground between them. Sedulius is not Italian; the *Rythmus Ludovici* on the other hand fits its Italian (Veronese) manuscript context perfectly and looks impeccably Italian. These appear to be two works independently conceived and executed rather than fragments of a cultural whole. One would also note the importance of death verses, (the Bobbio lament as well as the epitaphs mentioned above) although this may simply indicate the greater likelihood of these pieces surviving.

Deciding on the perception of these images is even more difficult than establishing their context in the first place. We have little more than the poems themselves and their codicology to guide us and as I indicated above this is unhelpful. The importance of Verona XC has been dealt with earlier but it is a problematical manuscript, in its current form clearly designed as a collection of verses. This suggests however that it offers few insights into the *original* audience for the poems it contains, including the three considered above. Most of the other pieces survive alone; their context is unhelpful. Since so many different formats are used in the pieces under consideration (poems and prose, various metres, abecedarius-forms, hymns, echoes of scripture, legal language) deciding on how a piece might have been perceived is peculiarly difficult. An exception is of course Louis II's epitaph which was presumably clearly visible somewhere in S. Ambrogio, perhaps near his tomb, given the ardour of the archbishop

to have the emperor's body deposited in Milan.¹⁶⁸ However this opens up the possibility that the epitaph may have been commissioned by the archbishop rather than Louis's family, thus multiplying the problems associated with interpreting it.

This all makes the Italian poetic material typically frustrating, a series of peripheral views of the Italian rulers from those either outside Italy (Angilbert, Sedulius) or from environments which, while difficult to contextualize, are, as I have argued above, probably not 'courtly', using extemporized poetic language borrowed from a wide variety of other fields. For convenience one can split the Italian verses into two main groups: those specifically about the Carolingians (Angilbert's poem, the Avar verses, the Bobbio lament, Sedulius's work, the 871 *Rythmus*) and those essentially about the Italian towns or regions (the *Versus de Verona*, *Carmen de Aquileia*). The latter are arguably the more impressive because they show the Carolingians had some sort of impact at a local level. Indeed although some Italian writers, like abbot Bertarius of Montecassino, are reported to have written verses for the Carolingians,¹⁶⁹ no link can be established between most of the anonymous verses and the Carolingians. However there is one consolation, if this is so: it is a striking testament to the high profile of the Carolingians in Italy that it was still felt worthwhile writing about them. It suggests that the Carolingians were not distant figures whose actions were unknown (as has sometimes been suggested on the basis of for example, Andreas of Bergamo's work)¹⁷⁰ but were of great interest even in the Italian 'provinces'. It implies that the image of the Carolingians could penetrate to local levels and might exist even without direct patronage. This is an important conclusion because it means that the Carolingians may have been a subject for composition irrespective of whether the works thus produced were destined for the Carolingian court. This is to say that, unlike Godman, I would not interpret these poems simply as bids for favour. They may be authentic literary productions without ulterior motives. The Carolingians were thus perceived to be

¹⁶⁸Cf Andreas of Bergamo's account of the struggle over Louis's body between the bishop of Brescia and the archbishop of Milan: *MGH SS RL* p. 229, c. 18. Cf. above. ch. II, pp. 73.

¹⁶⁹Above n. 27.

¹⁷⁰Above ch. III, pp. 121-22.

important topics in their own right; hence from the lack of evidence for a court culture we can draw one positive conclusion: people wrote about the Carolingians because they wanted to. Getting closer to the meaning of these images is difficult. Perhaps the rulers were understood as representations (or even personifications) of the state. They were part of the mental furniture of ninth-century inhabitants of Italy. This implies that, as topics if not as patrons, they occupied a far more central place in the culture of ninth century northern Italy than has generally been allowed.

V

Coins and the Carolingians in Italy

Coins are important in the context of representations of the Carolingians because they were a governmental medium - at least such was often the case. They therefore provide an approach to the Carolingians representation of themselves on at least one 'official' source. Furthermore the circulation of coins makes them particularly important because they *may* have reached a very wide audience, conceivably even a broad cross-section of the population. I shall deal with this question later. These representational aspects of the currency can also be associated with the political importance of coins. The ruler's concern with authenticity and authorization (who had the right to strike coins, for example ?) could make coins statements of legitimacy in themselves. Adherence to the proper format therefore became an issue in itself, especially for example in Benevento.

Methodologically this might seem to be a simple subject requiring only the compilation of the various legends and images on the coins and their assembly into a chronology. However since cataloguing the evidence involves assessing it, the material is inseparable from its historiography. Below I shall attempt, firstly, to establish a 'baseline' narrative of the development of the coinage by presenting the conventional accounts found in current works; secondly to consider some examples where the format of the coinage was of especial significance, as in Benevento and thirdly to deal with some of the more general problems concerning this category of evidence and its inevitable relationship to economic matters.

Introductory Comments: There are surprising historiographical problems in approaching the study of Carolingian coins in Italy. Fundamental work is available, especially by Grierson, but the importance of English-language studies in this area is an indication of its relative neglect by French, German and Italian numismatists and historians

who have tended to stick to coins from their respective national territories or in the case of Italians, to ignore Carolingian issues almost entirely, perhaps because it has not seemed to conform to the preferred regional historiographical unit. Thus one is compelled to use histories of medieval currency in general in conjunction with analyses of specific series or hoards to try and bridge the gap. This inevitably leaves questions where it is impossible, without examining large numbers of coins, to get the kind of critical comparisons from which to draw hard conclusions. This section therefore cannot be more than a preliminary survey.

Although I shall occasionally refer to the coins' metrology in general I shall concentrate on the iconographical aspects of currency because this carries a more obviously ideological purpose. Here there are problems however. The 'immobilization of types' whereby a particular coin type was used by rulers with the same name (e.g. Louis the Pious and Louis II: see below) should warn us against being too ready to associate form with a *specific* meaning. Moreover the Carolingians seldom struck 'special issues' to commemorate events so their use of the coinage as an ideological vehicle was limited. Thus 'coin types do not on the whole provide any evidence for establishing a chronology of Carolingian mintage; dissociated from particular events, their only value is in their abstract symbolic content'.¹

Before 774 the kingdom of the Lombards (including Spoleto, which never seems to have had its own currency, but excluding Benevento which did: see below) only achieved a unified coinage under Desiderius. It is often claimed that the number of mints in operation after 774 was very small - perhaps no more than three or four (Milan, Pavia, Venice). In fact, if we consider the number of issues certainly struck at various mints in

¹A convenient summary for all this is K. F. Morrison & H. Grunthal, *Carolingian Coinage*, (Numismatic Notes and Monographs; American Numismatic Society 1967, no. 158), [henceforward Morrison & Grunthal, CC], pp. 1-8, 22f, quote from 22. However this work must be used with some caution: see P. Grierson's review in *Numismatic Chronicle* 7th series, vol. LX (1969), pp. 346-50. Now to be preferred is P. Grierson & M. Blackburn, *Medieval European Coinage*, vol. I *The Early Middle Ages (Fifth to Tenth Centuries)*, (Cambridge, 1986) [henceforth Grierson & Blackburn, MEC] which does not however aim to be a complete catalogue but is only a handbook.

Italy under the Carolingians it is surprisingly large. Admittedly for most of these mints we cannot demonstrate more than one or two issues, usually represented by a very few coins, but the implication is that there may have been many more mints in operation (albeit striking limited volumes of coin) than is often thought. Issues are known from, for example, Castel Seprio, Parma, Florence, Lucca, Treviso² and perhaps Ravenna and Bergamo³ too. Thus the assumption that Charlemagne, who made several alterations to north Italian moneys, was operating within a fairly centralized system may be somewhat overstated. Morrison and Grunthal's catalogue ends each regnal section with series of coins of 'indeterminate mints'. Some of these coins may be Italian. The question of the origin of these indeterminate mint coins, their relationship to royal/imperial issues, their circulation and the significance (if any) of their mere existence, much less their iconography, all have yet to be satisfactorily answered. Potentially such an analysis could revolutionize our picture of Carolingian moneying and the economy. What follows may therefore require radical revision in future.

In the Italian context recall that under the supposedly equally tightly-organized Lombard state Tuscan moneyers (especially in Lucca) pursued an independent course until the reign of Desiderius. Even then a unified coinage was not created by bringing Tuscan moneyers into line with the rest of the kingdom but by changing royal coins from the Po valley and Friuli to fit the Tuscan model.⁴ This is an impressive testament to Desiderius's control of Friulan and Padano mints but it is less clear what it tells us about his control of Tuscan mints. If any of the distinctive traditions of Lucchese moneying survived into the

²Morrison & Grunthal, *CC*, nos. 204-6, pp. 107-8; nos. 212a-225, pp. 109-111; nos. 452-4, pp. 146-7; no. 559, pp. 167.

³E. Bernareggi, 'Carolingian Gold Coins from the Ilanz Hoard', eds. C.N.L. Brooke, B. H. I. H. Stewart, J. G. Pollard, T. R. Volk, *Studies in Numismatic Method Presented to Philip Grierson*, (Cambridge, 1983), pp. 127-35 at 128, 132; Grierson & Blackburn, *MEC* I, p. 210 claim that early issues of Lombard-type tremisses for Charlemagne come from the Bergamo mint; not listed by Morrison & Grunthal.

⁴Grierson & Blackburn, *MEC* I, pp. 63, 65.

Carolingian period, as seems likely,⁵ it is possible that some of the 'indeterminate mint' coins originated there. Certainly Lucca was an important mint both immediately before the Carolingian conquest and again in the early tenth century when its currency may have determined changes to that of Rome under Alberic.⁶ We know of issues from Lucca under Charlemagne and Louis the Pious.⁷ I find it surprising that, out of the whole Medieval period, the Lucca mint was not productive only in the later half of the ninth century.⁸ More probably I think we have yet to identify, or else, find evidence of its operation. Again in an Italian context note further that Treviso struck unique early monogrammed coins of Charlemagne later adopted, with modifications, universally [see below]. Evidently something of the individualism of pre-Carolingian mints survived here. So we should bear in mind the possibility (actually nearly a certainty) that the identifiable royal/imperial issues circulated alongside other less formal, perhaps regional,⁹ coins as well as the issues of earlier rulers.¹⁰ This has obvious implications for the ideological significance of coins which would be only a part of the currency in circulation, therefore tending to dilute the impact of iconographical changes. Despite this however the Carolingian rulers themselves were interested enough to attempt to demonetize earlier coin issues on occasion, apparently successfully (e.g. Charlemagne's demonetization of his class II coins, Louis the Pious's demonetization of Charlemagne's class IV, Lothar's gradual demonetization of his father's issues¹¹) but it must be open to doubt whether these demonetizations were

⁵Grierson, 'Money', p. 507 note at foot of table II records a coin from Lucca with a facing (not profile) bust, and p. 515 where Lucchese coins borrow motifs from Anglo-Saxon ones; cf. C. E. Blunt, 'Four Italian Coins Imitating Anglo-Saxon Types', *British Numismatic Journal* 26 (1948), pp. 282-5.

⁶Preceding note and Grierson & Blackburn, *MEC* I, pp. 263-4.

⁷Morrison & Grunthal, *CC*, nos. 221-4, pp. 110-111; no. 454, p. 147.

⁸Although Grierson, 'Money', p. 517, Grierson & Blackburn, *MEC* I, p. 196, do not share my surprise, believing that the Roman mint replaced Lucca and Pisa in central Italy. Given the extreme difficulty of identifying coins of Louis II [see below] I am not convinced.

⁹Grierson, 'La Trouvaille Monétaire d'Ilanz', *Gazette Numismatique Suisse* IV (1953), pp. 46-8 at 48 who suggests Tuscan Lombard gold coins enjoyed only such a regional circulation; followed by Bernareggi, 'Ilanz', p. 131.

¹⁰On the latter point Morrison & Grunthal, *CC*, p. 4.

¹¹These are all complex events and the degree of success of the demonetizations can only be judged on the basis of hoard evidence. Moreover each demonetization was in some way unique: the 793 reform was an internal matter; the post 814-change presumably partly ideological and moreover relatively easy because

motivated by the desire to replace one ideological message with another. Lothar's coins, for example, were almost exactly similar to those of his father. Moreover coins even in the classical Roman era seem to have had only a limited public impact.¹² Combined with the immobilization of types and widespread illiteracy this suggests one should be sceptical about assuming too substantial an effect on the population at large.

Alongside the possibility that coins were literally illegible (some of the coins were as small as 12mm in diameter) Grierson's association of various capitulary orders with the introduction of new coins¹³ is important because it proves the close control of at least aspects of the currency exercised by an early medieval ruler. Equally significantly, one suspects it offered the ruler the opportunity to explain the reason for the introduction of the new coinage. Clearly the ideological meaning of alterations to a coin's format could be easily explained to the restricted circle at court who witnessed its promulgation. I shall return to all the issues raised in the above pages at the end of the chapter. Firstly I shall describe the coinage of Italy and the Carolingians' influence upon it.

Northern Italy: Neither Pippin nor Bernard struck any coins as far as is known.¹⁴ Charlemagne minted alone for this period. His coinage is generally split into four types:¹⁵ 1) a continuation of late Lombard gold tremisses with Charlemagne's name and title rendered D NS CAROLUS (note without the royal title); these coins circulated nowhere else in the empire.¹⁶

few of the class IV coins had been struck because of their late introduction. Lothar's gradual withdrawal of his father's coins probably reflects the large volume of them in circulation and indicates an economic rather than an ideological decision: see Grierson & Blackburn, *MEC* I, pp. 208-9.

¹²M. H. Crawford, 'Roman Imperial Coin Types and the Formation of Public Opinion', *Studies...Grierson*, pp. 47-64.

¹³First demonstrated in 'La Cronologia delle Riforme Monetarie di Carlo Magno', *Rivista Italiana di Numismatica*, 1954 pp. 65-79; [repr. *Dark Age Numismatics* no. XVII].

¹⁴Although a very brief issue of Louis the Pious in Aquitaine is known: Grierson & Blackburn, *MEC* I, p. 195; this is probably the issue Morrison & Grunthal, *CC*, pp. 2-3 use to try and suggest that coins were struck by sons before their fathers' death. Grierson, *Numismatic Chronicle* 1969, pp. 348f. is sceptical.

¹⁵For the following schematic account of Carolingian Italian coins: Grierson & Blackburn, *MEC* I, pp. 206-10, essentially based on Grierson, 'Money and Coinage under Charlemagne', *KG* vol. I pp. 501-36 esp. 506-7, 513-16; [repr. in *Dark Age Numismatics* no. XVIII].

¹⁶Grierson & Blackburn, *MEC* I, p. 194; best consideration of these coins is Bernareggi, 'Ilanz', pp. 127-34.

class 2) Charlemagne's first original issues in Italy, probably introduced in 781, a silver denarius which substantially replaced the Lombard gold-based coinage; Charlemagne's name on the obverse as CARO/LVS, mint name or mint name monogram on the reverse;

class 3) a new denarius was introduced, probably c. 793/4. It bore Charlemagne's monogram on the reverse and a cross on the obverse. It bore a superficial similarity to some of Desiderius's later coins, which also had a cross on the obverse (although of different proportions to that on the Carolingian coins).¹⁷ I shall return to this below.

class 4) issued from 812-14, Charlemagne finally ordered an 'imperial' currency to be struck. The obverse bore a profile bust of the emperor, moustachioed (but not bearded) and wearing a laurel wreath. The reverse varied but generally showed a tetrastyle temple. These coins bore the legend XRISTIANA RELIGIO, by which title the series is often known. Schumacher-Wolfgarten has recently suggested that these issues should be associated with Charlemagne's donation of alms to the Holy Places in 812 and has emphasized the similarity of the temple on the reverse to the illustration of the Holy Sepulchre on the sixth-century ampullae in the cathedral treasury at Monza. (She is wise enough to avoid suggesting that it was the ampullae themselves which furnished the image but rather their iconographical tradition).¹⁸ This idea can be rejected for several reasons. The Monza ampullae do represent the Holy Sepulchre but different versions of the image of the Holy Sepulchre also circulated in the early Carolingian world, especially architectural images which emphasized the circular form of the sepulchre.¹⁹ Schumacher-Wolfgarten offers no explanation why the Monza-type iconography was preferred over any other. The image of the temple could be almost any major late antique basilica facade. The coin could have indicated easily that it depicted the Holy Sepulchre. Moreover many

¹⁷E.g. see illustration in E. Arslan, *Le Monete di Ostrogoti, Longobardi e Vandali. Catalogo delle Civiche Raccolte Numismatiche di Milano*, (Milan, 1978), no. L 64.

¹⁸R. Schumacher-Wolfgarten, 'XPICTIANA RELIGIO. Zu einer Münzprägung Karls des Großen', *Jahrbuch für Antike und Christentum*, 37 (1994), pp. 122-41.

¹⁹C. Heitz, *Recherches sur les rapports entre Architecture et Liturgie à l'Epoque Carolingienne*, (Paris, 1963), pp. 113, 115 fig. 34, pl. XXIX; from Bibliothèque Nationale Lat. 13.048, fol 4v; Vienne Cod. 458, fol. 4v.

other versions of this coin do *not* have a temple on the reverse but rather a tower or boat.²⁰ Schumacher-Wolfgarten does not integrate these images into her scheme. It is hard to see how her very specific interpretation can explain so diverse an iconography. Louis the Pious seems to have withdrawn these coins very soon after becoming emperor since few examples are known.²¹ One final point with regard to the Italian Class 4 coins of Charlemagne: Rovelli has argued that perhaps the differences in reverse types may reflect different ideological significance. Class 4 coins from Pavia bear the legend PAPIA CIVITA and on the reverse the image of a gate, indicating secular power; the same series issued in Milan does not use the epithet *civita* [sic] and has a temple on the reverse, symbolizing the city's ecclesiastical power as an archbishopric. However Rovelli acknowledges that this idea is less convincing in the context of the whole empire.²² However she has perhaps at least partly penetrated the problem. Only one other coin issue anywhere in the empire has both the gate reverse and the *civitas* epithet, Toulouse, which like Pavia was effectively the capital of a sub-kingdom.²³ The iconography of these coins may therefore be a reflection of the political and ecclesiastical status of the cities where they were minted.

Louis the Pious's coins were of lasting importance. Until c. 819 he continued with a version of Charlemagne's type 4 denarii substituting Louis's name for his father's. These were then replaced by coins of a new design, with on the obverse, a circumscription of the emperor's name around an equal-armed cross in a roundel, and on the reverse the mint name written across the field, sometimes in more than one line if the name was lengthy.²⁴ These were in their turn replaced c. 822 by Louis the Pious's type 3 coins which reverted

²⁰Grierson & Blackburn, *MEC* I, p. 209.

²¹Grierson & Blackburn, *MEC* I, p. 209.

²²A. Rovelli, 'Il Denaro di Pavia nell'alto medioevo (VIII-XI secolo)' *Bollettino della Società Pavese di Storia Patria*, anno XCV, vol. n.s XLVII (1995), pp. 71-90 at 75-6 & n. 25.

²³Thus C. R. Brühl, *Palatium und Civitas: Bd. I Gallien. Studien zur Profanopographie spätantiker civitates vom 3 bis zum 13 Jahrhundert*, (Vienna, 1975), p. 190.

²⁴Morrison & Grunthal, *CC*, pp. 145-7, nos. 447-8, 451, 453-4. A sub-group of Milan coins at least temporarily retained the temple on the reverse: *ibid.* p. 146, no. 450.

to the legend *xpictiana religio* with a tetrastyle temple on the reverse. The type 3 coins were retained until 840. These coins were usually issued without mint names and, although some mints have been identified on the basis of details on the coins (notably Milanese issues) the objective was clearly 'an absolutely uniform coinage circulating throughout the empire without reference to the specific localities'.²⁵ They provided the model for all the Italian coins of Lothar I (which are iconographically and metrologically the same as those of his father apart from the inscription²⁶) and for issues of Louis II. Not all these north Italian coins were exactly the same. The exact format of the circumscription varied slightly. Both Louis the Pious's and Lothar's coins used the name and title of the emperor in slightly differing forms: the name of the emperor suffixed either by -AVG/C (HLUDOVICUSIMPAVC)²⁷ or simply IMP (as in HLUDOVICVSIMP).²⁸ After 840 HLOTHARIVSIMPAU(gustus) appeared on one Pavian series,²⁹ and HLOTHARIVSIMR³⁰ on another; one Milan series has HLOTHARIUSIMP.³¹ The iconography of these coins remained constant however.

The coins of the two Louis's are often difficult to distinguish: those of Louis II are made of slightly thinner material and have slightly wider discs.³² This thinning and widening is part of a general process overtaking north Italian coins in the second half of the ninth century which continues under Berengar I. But this is generally true of Italian coins even as early as the late eighth century.³³ Since this development seems to be evolutionary (i.e. the later the coin, the thinner and wider it is) reading the process back would lead us to expect that coins from early in Louis II's reign might be thicker and of

²⁵Grierson & Blackburn, *MEC I*, pp. 213-16, quotation from 216.

²⁶Grierson & Blackburn, *MEC I*, p. 224.

²⁷Morrison & Grunthal, *CC*, p. 146, nos. 449, 452 from Milan and Treviso respectively.

²⁸Morrison & Grunthal, *CC*, pp. 147-9, nos. 447-8, 450-1, 453-8.

²⁹Morrison & Grunthal, *CC*, p. 166, no. 556. Cf the circumscription on the Venetian series, *ibid.* p. 167, no. 560.

³⁰Morrison & Grunthal, *CC*, p. 166, no. 557.

³¹Morrison & Grunthal, *CC*, p. 166, no. 558.

³²Grierson & Blackburn, *MEC I*, pp. 252, 216.

³³Grierson & Blackburn, *MEC I*, pp. 194, 208.

narrower diameter than those from later - and therefore practically indistinguishable from those of Louis the Pious (as Grierson and Blackburn say). Therefore those coins attributed to Louis II are probably from late in his reign when the process was sufficiently well-advanced to be obvious. It is striking in this regard that Morrison & Grunthal's 1966 catalogue, for example, lists *no* north Italian issues *at all* for the period of Louis II's reign before his marriage (850-63): they only list issues including Angilberga's name or from Benevento i.e. coins identifiable by other criteria.³⁴ I suspect that some of the north Italian issues listed for Louis the Pious may be of his grandson but no reliable method of distinguishing them has yet been found.³⁵ The coins' metrology might offer a way forward. However the metrology of Louis II's coins can only be reconstructed on the basis of either coins struck by Louis's successors or on the basis of those *non-standard* issues mentioned above concerning Angilberga and Benevento. Unfortunately Beneventan coins have a different standard metrology³⁶ and are therefore useless for establishing the metrology of north Italian coins. The northern coins of later Carolingians seem to have maintained their weight fairly well at c. 1.7g.³⁷ This must imply that Louis II's coins too adhered to the standard weight of Louis the Pious's issues even more closely than is sometimes believed hence making it doubly difficult to identify them.

Papal Coins: Lastly the Papal currency is important in the context of the imperial coronation. Products of the Roman mint are known from the mid-eighth century (there are a handful of slightly earlier issues but they appear to have been coin weights rather than issues proper).³⁸ These early coins were Byzantine in style, but with the pope's name in the inscription as well as that of the eastern emperor.³⁹ The first decisive break with the

³⁴Morrison & Grunthal, *CC*, nos. 1172-82, pp. 259-60.

³⁵Morrison & Grunthal, *CC*, p. 1: 'there is no evidence which distinguishes the pieces struck in the thirty or forty years after Louis [the Pious]'s death from those struck in his lifetime'. However, Grierson, *NC*, 1969, pp. 348f believes Louis II's coins can be distinguished at least sometimes.

³⁶See below.

³⁷Grierson & Blackburn *MEC* I, p. 194, pl. 46, nos. 1007-1014.

³⁸Grierson & Blackburn, *MEC* I, pp. 262-3.

³⁹P. Grierson, *Catalogue of the Byzantine Coins in the Dumbarton Oaks Collection and in the Whittemore Collection*, with A. R. Bellinger, (Washington, 1973), vol. III pp. 87-91; idem. *Byzantine*

preceding Byzantine-style coins occurred under Hadrian I, certainly after 772 (when Byzantine imperial regnal years were still in use)⁴⁰ and probably specifically in 781. Hadrian introduced silver coins with a facing bust of St. Peter (or, just possibly the pope himself,⁴¹ although this seems rather unlikely) and the circumscription DN ADRIANUS PA(pa) on the obverse and on the reverse a continuation of the Byzantine 'cross-on-steps' motif flanked by *RM* for 'Roma'.⁴² The name of the Carolingian ruler was not included.

Leo III's coinage is exiguous. If Grierson is correct to attribute a sole silver denier of a pope Leo to Leo III's reign before 800 then he has proved that Leo placed Charlemagne's name on the papal currency *before* the imperial coronation - a conclusion of great importance. However the only way of dating this coin is by its hoard context. It was found in the nineteenth century in Ireland and is the only Continental coin in the hoard, which Grierson argues was buried c.838.⁴³ It is obviously impossible to cross-check this because the coin is unique. Certainly after the coronation Leo placed Charlemagne's name on the papal currency.⁴⁴ Coins are known with Leo and Louis the Pious's name on them of the new imperial type which Louis introduced shortly after his accession.⁴⁵ This coin shows incidentally that the new imperial issues must have been in existence before Leo's death, so by mid-816 at the latest. From Paschal to John VIII the currency's form is stable and based on the imperial issue of Louis the Pious and his successors: on the obverse the papal monogram surrounded by the legend SCS PETRUS and on the reverse a circumscription of the name of the Carolingian ruler round a monogram of *imp*, *pius* or *Roma*.⁴⁶ At some

Coins, (London, Los Angeles, 1982), pp.168-70, pl. 39, no. 722 [with pope Gregory II] both give full accounts of the eighth-century papal issues.

⁴⁰Grierson, *Catalogue of...Dumbarton Oaks*, pp. 90-1.

⁴¹Grierson & Blackburn, *MEC* I, p. 264.

⁴²Muntoni, *Monete*, nos. 1-3, p. 3, tav. 1; *Corpus Nummorum Italicarum*, [henceforward *CNI*] vol. XV. 1 (Milan, 1934) p. 63, nos. 9-11, tav. IV, nos. 1,2; Grierson & Blackburn, *MEC* I, pl. 47 nos. 1031-2.

⁴³Grierson, 'The Coronation of Charlemagne and the Coinage of Leo III', *Rev. Belge de Philologie et d'Histoire* 30 (1952), pp. 825-33; [repr. *Dark Age Numismatics*, no. XX].

⁴⁴*CNI* XV.1, pp. 65-6, nos. 1-3; tav. IV n. 5.

⁴⁵*CNI* XV.1 p. 66, nos. 5-7, tav. IV, n. 5.

⁴⁶Grierson & Blackburn, *MEC* I, p. 263; *CNI* XV.1, pp. 65f. I cannot discern any pattern to the changes of reverse monogram on Papal coins. The *imp* monogram appears on issues of Leo III, Valentine and Leo

point in his reign John VIII introduced a new papal coin with St. Peter in three-quarter profile on the obverse. This persisted into the late tenth century.

Monograms: the use of monograms as marker symbols on coins and documents was frequent in the early medieval West.⁴⁷ Papal monograms survive also as parts of mosaics.⁴⁸ Lombard coins too sometimes used monograms.⁴⁹ Charlemagne used his monogram to validate documents but the Treviso mint also used it on the *obverse* of its coins⁵⁰ (otherwise similar to the rest of the contemporary north Italian coinage) even before the reforms of 793/4 after which the practice of using Charlemagne's monogram was adopted on his currency generally but for the reverse rather than the obverse of coins.⁵¹ It has been argued that the presence of a monogram on coins was a guarantee of their authenticity and proper weight and metallic content.⁵² However the Treviso mint apparently adopted the practice of its own accord (unless it was the testbed for the new currency) and implemented it differently. It is striking that a single mint apparently 'going it alone' seems to have subsequently found its practice adopted universally, presumably at the ruler's instigation.

Not all aspects of the use of Charlemagne's monogram are straightforward. One particularly interesting coin merits prolonged discussion because the historiography concerning it has thrown out many important (or confusing) points. Moreover an attempt has been made recently to associate the coin with the papal coins discussed above. It is a denarius with Charlemagne's monogram in Latin letters on one side and uniquely, in

IV; *pius* on coins of Stephen IV, Gregory IV, Sergius II, Leo IV (second issue), Benedict III; *Roma* on coins of Paschal I, Eugene I, Nicholas I, Hadrian II, John VIII (earliest issues): *CNI* XV.1, pp. 65-75.

⁴⁷Grierson, 'Symbolism in Early Medieval Charters and Coins', *Simboli e Simbologia nell'alto medioevo*, (SSpol XXIII, 1976), pp. 601-30.

⁴⁸W. Oakeshott, *The Medieval Mosaics of Rome*, (London, 1967) pp. 202; 206 & pl. XX; 214 & pl. XXIII.

⁴⁹Arslan, *Monete*, p. 22, n. 28 concerning duke Faroald's brief occupation of Classe in 579; O. Flämig, *Monogramme auf Münzen, Medaillen, Marken, Zeichen und Urkunden*, (Braunschweig, 1968), nos. 127-34, pp. 11 & 120.

⁵⁰Morrison & Grunthal, *CC*, nos. 215-219, pp. 109-110.

⁵¹Grierson & Blackburn, *MEC* I, pp. 199, 208.

⁵²Morrison & Grunthal, *CC*, p. 23.

Greek letters on the other, which has led to the very few examples known being attributed to Ravenna.⁵³ However this attribution poses difficulties. The Ravenna mint appears to close down at just this point⁵⁴ although since Byzantine mints appear to abandon the use of mint names from the mid-eighth century⁵⁵ this may be an illusion. If the coin is from Ravenna it is noteworthy that it is struck without reference to the pope,⁵⁶ particularly since Noble has suggested that they shared joint rule there.⁵⁷ This is not like the situation even in Rome itself, where the currency referred to both the Pope and Charlemagne.⁵⁸

Schumacher-Wolfgarten has recently reinterpreted the reverse monogram as ΠΑ ΛΕΩ (an abbreviation for Papa Leo),⁵⁹ apparently without realizing that the coin in question is the issue interpreted by Thompson and Grierson as Charlemagne's monogram in Greek. [see above] The new interpretation is unconvincing. The monogram clearly uses minuscule letters so the monogram ought to have been rendered πα λεω. But the letter form rising from the main ascender is clearly either a Latin 'P' or the Greek rho, so it is impossible to argue for πα as an abbreviation for *papa* unless one hypothesizes a mixture of Greek and Latin letters in the monogram, which would be unique. Similarly I am far from convinced that the letter at top right of the monogram is the epsilon of λεω. It appears to have no

⁵³M. Thompson, 'The Monogram of Charlemagne in Greek', *Museum Notes* XII (1966) (The American Numismatic Society), pp. 125-7 [repr. in *Dark Age Numismatics*, no. XVIII]; Cf. again also Grierson & Blackburn, *MEC* I pp. 199, 208.

⁵⁴M. F. Hendy, *Studies in the Byzantine Monetary Economy c. 300-1450*, (Cambridge, 1985), p. 422 give the classic date 751-2 for the end of Ravenna's mint; but Grierson, *Byzantine Coins*, pp. 168-9, and Grierson, *Catalogue of...Dumbarton Oaks*, III, i, p. 93 notes the absence of folles for Leo III or Constantine V, 'although since this denomination was struck by Aistulf they are probably still to be found'; and indeed E. Ercolani Cocchi, *Imperi Romano e Bizantino, Regni Barbarici in Italia attraverso le Monete del Museo Nazionale di Ravenna*, (Bologna, 1984), p. 35 claims to have identified a Ravennate follis of Constantine V which postdates (or is at least associated with) Aistulf's conquest; on closure of the mint and the general obscurity of this period of Ravenna's numismatic history, G. Gorini, 'La Zecca di Ravenna', *SRavenna* II, 2, pp. 209-38 at 232-3.

⁵⁵Ercolani Cocchi, *Imperi*, p. 35 despite noting the loss of mint names from Byzantine coins still asserts that coin production became concentrated at Constantinople. Without mint names I do not see how this can be proved. We know Naples and Rome continued to mint. Conversely however there is no direct proof of Ravenna striking much later than c. 750. See preceding note.

⁵⁶Gorini, 'Zecca', p. 232.

⁵⁷Noble, *Republic*, pp. 182, 171-2, 250-2; Grierson & Blackburn, *MEC* I, p. 262.

⁵⁸Grierson & Blackburn, *MEC* I, pp. 210, 262.

⁵⁹Schumacher-Wolfgarten, 'XPICTIANA RELIGIO', p. 139 n. 99.

horizontal middle stroke. Thompson's assumption that it is a Latinate form of sigma therefore seems more likely (although on some ninth century Papal coins 'e' was rendered without the central stroke - but only as a Latin letter form, not as a Greek epsilon⁶⁰.) Lastly the only surviving copy of Leo III's monogram (admittedly, by a Renaissance scholar) from the mosaic on the arch of SS. Nereo & Achilleo, restored by Leo in 815, is quite different in form from the monogram on the coin.⁶¹ However one must acknowledge the lateness of the evidence, that papal mosaic monograms are demonstrably often different from papal coin monograms and that the mosaic monogram was in Latin letters while the coin monogram is in Greek ones. The relevance of the mosaic monogram evidence is uncertain and cannot therefore decisively *disprove* a papal origin for the Greek monogram issue.

None of this really brings us any nearer a convincing attribution of this coin type. Let us consider a number of hitherto neglected aspects of the issue. Thompson concentrated on the monogram alone to the detriment of a proper consideration of the rest of the coin. It is highly unusual. Standard class II coins of Charlemagne have a cross with circumscription (often the mint name) on the reverse and a monogram with Charlemagne's title(s) on the obverse. Unusually the Greek-monogram coin has no mint name or cross, and instead rulers' monograms on both sides. Were this coin struck in Rome one might expect it to have similarities to contemporary papal issues. However papal coins of the early Carolingian period undergo profound changes. As mentioned earlier Hadrian I's coins have a frontal bust of St. Peter on the obverse and on the reverse a cross-on-steps.⁶² Unfortunately it is precisely the coinage of Leo III which is least understood. Several coin types are known from (or attributed to) his reign. Particularly important is that only one single surviving coin has been attributed to the period before the imperial coronation.⁶³ It

⁶⁰Cf. Grierson & Blackburn, *MEC* I, pl. 47, nos. 1034-9 of Gregory IV where the 'e' of GRE[gorius] appears without a middle horizontal stroke.

⁶¹Illus. Oakeshott, *Mosaics* p. 202.

⁶²Presumably one of those 'many Byzantine features' referred to by Grierson & Blackburn, *MEC* I, p. 264.

⁶³Grierson, 'Coinage of Leo III', pp. 825-33.

is not especially similar to those of Hadrian I much less the coins of Leo's successors. Grierson's dating of the coin depends on its coin hoard context. Admittedly the coin does not fit easily into the issues of any of the other Leonine popes but the difficulty is that it constitutes the only evidence for this period of Leo's reign. Obviously it is therefore impossible to check it against other issues. When evidence re-emerges for the very end of Leo III's reign⁶⁴ the coinage is different again being based on Louis the Pious's new imperial coins introduced c.816.

The Greek-monogram coin discussed above is not particularly like any of these issues. Deciding which side is the obverse and which the reverse is itself difficult. If we follow the inscription, CARLUS REX FR is on the obverse, the side with Charlemagne's monogram. The inscription continues on the other side ET LANG AC PAT ROM. This side, with the Greek letter monogram, is therefore the reverse. But Charlemagne's monogram appears on the *reverse* of other Italian coins. Only the Treviso coins referred to above place a monogram on the obverse.⁶⁵ Apart from the Greek monogram issue no other Carolingian coin has an inscription running over from obverse to reverse. Moreover the Greek monogram coin has neither bust nor 'cross-on-steps', unlike Hadrian I's coins. Likewise, except in the sense of having two monograms, it is quite unlike papal coins of the ninth century: it has no reference to St. Peter or Rome or the pope (except on Schumacher-Wolfgarten's doubtful interpretation of the reverse monogram). Moreover, neither of the monograms used on the Greek-monogram issue are used on any other papal coins at all. No later Carolingian ruler had his monogram on Papal coins (or indeed any north Italian coins at all - which does at least suggest a date in Charlemagne's reign offering support for Thompson's interpretation of the Greek monogram). The version of Charlemagne's title which appears spilling across both sides of the issue could have been taken from documents anywhere in the Lombard kingdom.

⁶⁴Promis, *Monete*, pp. 52f.

⁶⁵Above p. 175.

A consideration of the metrology of these coins is revealing. The weights of nine examples (from two different hoards and five collections) are listed by Morrison & Grunthal. They are 1.00gr, 1.46gr (two coins), 1.53gr, 1.59gr, 1.63 gr, 1.75gr (two examples), 1.76gr.⁶⁶ Grierson has noted that the standard weight of Carolingian coins before 793 was c. 1.3gr, after it 1.75gr, with variations in weight of as much as 0.2gr not unusual.⁶⁷ The five heaviest coins fit the profile for a weight of c.1.75gr but the three coins with lowest weight fit the profile only for the 1.3gr standard of pre-793 coins. (Admittedly this still leaves us with the problem of the 1.53gr coin which falls outside both categories.) If some of the Greek monogram coins weigh c.1.3gr and some c.1.75gr the issue must therefore straddle the 793/4 reform. If the issue is papal then some of these coins must have been struck under Hadrian I, whose coinage however never used Charlemagne's name. Given this I would suggest that the Greek-monogram issue cannot be Papal. Indeed if we set aside the ambiguous matter of the use of Greek letters in the monogram there is nothing at all to link the coin to Rome (or Ravenna) although an Italian origin, of some kind, does seem probable if only on the basis of the *rex lang ac pat rom* part of the inscription.⁶⁸ Louis the Pious abandoned the use of the monogram on his coinage and it was never revived by the Carolingians in Italy⁶⁹ except for a cruciform monogram of A, G, U, S for *augustus* on the reverse of a single issue of Louis II.⁷⁰

There is just one other possibility. In the whole of western Europe the only coins to place ruler monograms on both sides of an issue are silver denarii from Benevento with

⁶⁶Morrison & Grunthal, *CC*, p. 123, no. 308.

⁶⁷Grierson & Blackburn, *MEC* I, p. 194, 204.

⁶⁸Thus I fully agree with Grierson, 'Money', p. 517 & n. 82: the coin's 'attribution to the mint of Rome is ...without justification', (although as indicated above I see no reason to assume a Ravenna origin either) but [main text] 'while its Italian origin may be regarded as fairly certain its precise mint and purpose remain a mystery'.

⁶⁹Although Charles the Bald and Louis the German did use monograms on some of their coins: Grierson & Blackburn, *MEC* I, p. 199. Flämig, *Monogramme*, nos. 225-32, p. 15 & pp. 122-3 confuses Louis II, Louis the German, and his son Louis the Younger. Nos. 226 and 227 are papal issues with monograms of, respectively ROMA and NICOLAVS (Nicholas I, 858-67) on the reverse. None of the monograms of 'Hludovicus' reproduced are of Louis II.

⁷⁰Morrison & Grunthal, *CC* no. 1179, p. 259; pl. XXXVII. Below pp. 186-9.

Grimoald III's monogram on the reverse and Charlemagne's *Carolus* monogram on the obverse.⁷¹ However although the coin's double ruler-monogram format matches, the evidence is again inconclusive. The Latin version of Charlemagne's monogram is not the same as the Latin monogram used on the Greek-monogram coin. Moreover the weights of several of the Greek-monogram coins date them to after the 793 reform - suspiciously late since Grimoald is supposed to have stopped striking Carolingian issues c. 793. One way around this might be to suggest that Grimoald's abandonment of 'Carolingian' issues was a symptom of the breakdown in relations with Charlemagne rather than a cause.

Apart from the origin and chronology of the use of the monogram on coins there is the question of its function and perception. As indicated above the Papacy had used monograms for a very long time before their introduction onto Charlemagne's coinage c. 793/4. Moreover in Italy Lombard rulers had used it on their own coinage, notably on the well-known 752 Ravenna follis issued by Aistulf. This coin has generally been understood to have a particularly strong ideological importance since the capture of Byzantine Ravenna marked a signal triumph for Aistulf. This is perhaps significant in the ideological context of currency in Italy considering Charlemagne's and Louis II's attitude to Beneventan coinage which will be discussed further below. The reverse of Aistulf's solidus bore the traditional Byzantine reverse cross-on-steps motif reworked into a monogram of AYT on steps.⁷² The traditional cross-on-steps reverse, rather than the monogram, was used by Aistulf on the reverse of the Ravenna tremissis. The decision to alter the solidus but not the tremissis may not be casual. The gold solidus was the 'imperial' coin par excellence. To issue it was to make a claim to 'imperial' status.⁷³ Hence Aistulf's decision to place his monogram on the reverse of the solidus was quite a challenge to Byzantium. I

⁷¹Below pp. 183f..

⁷²Grierson, *Catalogue of...Dumbarton Oaks*, III, i, p. 93. Best illustrated in E. Bernareggi, *Il Sistema Economico e la Monetazione dei Longobardi nell'Italia Superiore*, (Milan, 1960), tav. VIII. Cf. *I Longobardi*, p. 169, no. IV. 25.

⁷³Bernareggi, *Il sistema*, p. 101: 'una emissione di prestigio...il solido bizantino, [era] la moneta imperiale per eccellenza...'

suspect circulating media (i.e the metal from which coins were struck) could be of ideological significance as much as the coin's iconography [below]. In Italy in particular, the use of a monogram on coins was far from unprecedented when Charlemagne introduced it in 793/4.⁷⁴ Moreover monograms need not be simply a ruler's name. Papal coins of the ninth century bore a monogram in the reverse field of the words PIUS, ROMA, or IMP/A with the Carolingian emperor's name circumscriptional.⁷⁵ Like Charlemagne's monogram all these designs were cruciform. It is hard to know if the illiterate would have been able to distinguish them from each other.

There is another question. A recent definition of the monogram has, reasonably enough, concentrated on geometrical form as its defining feature.⁷⁶ However if the monogram was supposed to be an indication of authenticity or effectively a kind of royal or imperial 'logo', we may be too narrow in considering the monogram alone. Even the illiterate can make out different script-types if sufficiently distinctive. Charlemagne's class III coins bear in the reverse field simply the legend CAROLVS, often broken into two lines of respectively four and three letters. Both the letter forms and the overall format of the legend are remarkably homogeneous on coins from mints across the Carolingian world.⁷⁷ The first and last letters of the lines (i.e. the C and the O in the first line, the L and the S in the second) which bookend the central part of the legend are noticeably smaller than the three central letters. The A and R of 'Carolus' are always ligatured and the point of contact of the two letters is often formed into a peak or bowl that obviously parallels the 'V' of 'Carolus' directly below. This gives the legend a decided graphic form in which the word 'Carolus' appears to be given a tapered, 'fish-eye lens' appearance. It is

⁷⁴Late Lombard coins introduced monograms from Aistulf's time onwards: *I Longobardi*, p. 169, IV. 24.

⁷⁵Promis, *Monete*, p. 46; Muntoni, *Monete*, pp. 4f., tav. 1,2; Grierson & Blackburn, *MEC* I, p. 264.

⁷⁶C. M. Haertle, 'Anmerkungen zum Karolingischen Münzmonogramm des 9. Jahrhunderts', ed. P. Rück, *Graphische Symbole in mittelalterlichen Urkunden. Beiträge zur diplomatischen Semiotik*, (Historische Hilfswissenschaften Bd. 3; Sigmaringen, 1996), pp. 263-91 at 280-1. This work does not refer to Italian coins after Charlemagne.

⁷⁷See e.g. Flämig, *Monogramme*, nos. 187 (Bonn), 189 (Strassburg), 191 (unknown), 193 (Milan), pp. 13 & 121.

uncertain whether the effect sought was stepped (i.e. the two central letters as one block, the flanking letters outside as another, rather like a crude cross), rounded or diamond-shaped. The latter form would be particularly interesting given the later move to a cruciform monogram based around a rhombus-shaped lozenge. Obviously this legend publicized the name of the new ruler within the *regnum Langobardorum*. But the legend's formalized, indeed stylized, script-type qualifies it as a symbol as much as as a word.⁷⁸ Therefore perhaps we should be wary of thinking of the introduction of a monogram on the reverse of Charlemagne's coins in 793/4 as indicating a clear break with previous practice. Quite apart from the precedents, the monogram may have actually functioned in the same way that the CAROLUS inscription did before.

The similarity of monogram types therefore raises the possibility that the change from stylized legends to monograms may have been of no more than formal significance. This obviously presents a difficult set of problems concerning reception. It is unlikely that these issues will ever be fully resolved. But one notes that after Charlemagne's reign no Carolingian north Italian coins ever used imperial or royal monograms again. This *may* be no more than the result of the conservatism of the Italian coinage from c. 816 onwards [see above]. Evidently if it was believed that the coinage was an effective vehicle for ideological messages, it was not one exploited in the *regnum italiae* after Louis the Pious's accession - or at least it was not exploited for short-term ideological messages. The iconographical consistency of north Italian coinage after 816 transmitted an image of stability and continuity. In other parts of Italy this was not the case.

Benevento and Venice: The ideological importance of the form of coins and titles is underscored by considering its application on the periphery of Carolingian Italy. The release of Grimoald III of Benevento, heir to the principality, in 788 to take up his inheritance was conditional on Charlemagne's name and titles being placed on Beneventan

⁷⁸Haertle, 'Anmerkungen', pp. 265-6 notes that in some examples the A and U of 'Carolus' are so compressed they become almost 'graphic symbols' (reduced to respectively a single and a double vertical stroke) but she does not take the next step of considering the legend as a whole as such a symbol.

charters and coins. Grimoald did so briefly but by c. 792 had reneged on the agreement.⁷⁹ Clearly the symbolism of authority was extremely important. Hence let us consider Benevento and Venice, two territories on the edge of the *regnum Italiae* proper which had their own coinage.

Benevento: The Carolingians directly influenced the form of Beneventan coins in the years from 778-c.792 and 866-71. Until 787 Benevento's coins were all gold solidi or tremissi and they had a distinctive format based on typical late antique and Byzantine issues: on the obverse a ruler portrait (generally a frontal bust, although there are a few issues with a standing figure)⁸⁰ and on the reverse a cross-on-steps. When in the late seventh century Lombard royal issues moved away from this iconography Benevento did not. Beneventan gold coins retained their form for the best part of two centuries with astonishingly little variation.⁸¹ The only substantial change was the introduction onto the coinage by Grimoald III of his full name rather than just the ruler's initials⁸² perhaps in reaction to the Carolingian requirement he put Charlemagne's name on the coinage [see below]. Given this very stable iconography it is noteworthy that Charlemagne's Beneventan issues altered the principality's gold coinage very little, perhaps suggesting that these issues were organized by local moneyers. There are however some interesting distinctions. Charlemagne's title was placed on the reverse of Benevento's gold coinage in the form of the circumscription *dom[inu]s car[olus] r[e]x vic[toria]*.⁸³ It has been suggested that a symbol at the end of the obverse inscription GRIMVAL is the monogram

⁷⁹Erchempert c. 4, p. 236, is the only source but appears to be confirmed by surviving coins: see below. The episode has been treated frequently by many authors including: Bertolini, 'Carlomagno e Benevento', pp. 648f, esp. 648-9; Noble, *Republic* pp. 178-80; Smith, 'Fines Imperii', *New Cambridge Medieval History*, ed. R. McKitterick, Cambridge, 1994) vol. II, pp. 169-89, at 175. This list is very far from exhaustive.

⁸⁰E.g. CNI XVIII, *Italia Meridionale Continentale (Zecche Minori)*, (Milan, 1939), tav. VII nos. 4, 5 of prince Sico (817-32).

⁸¹This stability can be seen very clearly in catalogues of Beneventan coins: e.g. CNI XVIII, pp. 117f., tav. VI, VII; *I Longobardi*, pp. 172-6. The above account of Beneventan coins from Grierson & Blackburn, *MEC* I, pp. 66-72.

⁸²Grierson & Blackburn, *MEC* I, p. 70.

⁸³CNI XVIII, pp. 154-5, nos. 1-11; tav. VI, 16-21.

for *dux*.⁸⁴ The symbol is difficult to distinguish in illustrations but this is potentially significant since Grimoald's title was *princeps*. Charlemagne may have been snubbing Grimoald by downgrading his title. If these issues were organized by local moneyers quite how Charlemagne could have made this fairly subtle point is not certain. It would certainly explain Grimoald's swift rejection of Carolingian domination and the removal of Charlemagne's name from Beneventan coins.

Although Charlemagne's monogram was placed on the reverse of Beneventan gold coins, it appeared on the obverse of Benevento's silver coinage, with Grimoald's monogram on the reverse.⁸⁵ This silver coinage is very revealing. Firstly, it was an innovation for Benevento to have a silver currency; its introduction in the first years of Grimoald III's reign shows that Benevento could no longer resist the economic (and perhaps ideological) pressure to join the rest of Western Europe's currency norms, which were dominated by the Carolingian silver coinage. Secondly, it adopted a very different iconography from that of the Beneventan gold coins: a monogram of the ruler's name appeared on it for the first time. That Charlemagne's monogram appeared on the obverse while Grimoald's monogram was relegated to the reverse, and the subsequent excision of Charlemagne's monogram c. 792, and its replacement on the obverse by Grimoald's monogram, shows that the distinction between obverse and reverse had ideological importance. After this date Grimoald's monogram appeared on the obverse of Benevento's silver coins while the reverse retained the traditional Beneventan cross-on-steps motif.⁸⁶ Subsequently although the gold coinage had an almost perfectly stable iconography, Beneventan princes were much more willing to innovate with the iconography of their

⁸⁴CNI XVIII, p. 154, nos. 1-6; tav. VI, no. 16; possibly slightly clearer in *I Longobardi*, p. 172, no. IV. 36 b.

⁸⁵CNI XVIII, pp. 155-6, nos. 12-14; tav. VI nos. 22-4; *I Longobardi*, p. 172, no. IV. 36 and IV. 37 [the latter not illustrated]. Grimoald's monogram is reproduced in several versions in Flämig, *Monogramme*, p. 120, nos. 139-43, esp. no. 143 which is also clearly visible in the denarius (of Grimoald's issue alone) reproduced in *I Longobardi* p. 174, IV 39D. One has to extrapolate obverse and reverse from the later issues of Grimoald III alone: see following note.

⁸⁶CNI XVIII, p. 156, nos. 15-21, tav. VI, nos. 25-8.

silver coins. Grimoald IV (806-17) introduced vegetal forms onto the obverse of his silver coins instead of the princely monogram.⁸⁷ Sico (817-32) however returned to a monogram of his name.⁸⁸

The version of Charlemagne's monogram on Beneventan coins varied slightly but was consistently an attempt to produce a four armed monogram comparable to that used on coins throughout the Carolingian empire. Versions of Grimoald's monogram, presumably early, also have a cruciform layout.⁸⁹ However his later coinage used a version of his monogram based around the letter M (whose two left hand strokes doubled as the descenders for the R of 'Grimoald').⁹⁰

If Charlemagne's impact on the Beneventan coinage was evolutionary (because although silver was introduced with a new iconography, the gold coinage was also continued) Louis II's Beneventan coins were by contrast a radical break. Benevento's traditional gold solidii and tremissi appear to have been discontinued and entirely replaced by silver denarii.⁹¹ This may have occurred before the Louis II returned to the south because no gold coins at all are known for Adelchis II of Benevento (858-78). Adelchis's issues without Louis are complicated and it is certainly possible that some predated Louis's intervention in the south. All these coins bore Adelchis's name on the obverse, sometimes slightly abbreviated or in the form of a monogram rather than a circumscription, and either the word BENEVENTVM or a version of ARHANGELVS MIHAEL.⁹² Some of the iconography of these coins appears to owe something to Carolingian issues, for example

⁸⁷CNI XVIII, pp. 159-61, nos. 1-14; tav. VII, nos. 1-3.

⁸⁸CNI XVIII, tav. VII, nos. 7-14.

⁸⁹CNI XVIII, p. 155, no. 12; tav. VI, no. 22.

⁹⁰CNI XVIII, p. 155, nos. 13, 14; tav. VI, nos. 23-7.

⁹¹E. Arslan, 'Sequenze dei Conii e Valutazioni Quantitative delle Monetazioni Argentea ed Aurea di Benevento Longobarda', *Rythmes de la Production Monétaire de l'Antiquité à nos jours*, eds. G. Depeyrot, T. Hackens, G. Moucharte, (Louvain-la-Neuve, 1987 - Numismatica Lovaniensia 7) pp. 387-408 at 406-7.

⁹²Adelchis's sole issues: CNI XVIII, pp. 180-3, nos. 1-28; tav. VII, nos. 23-30; p. 187, no. 55; tav. VIII, no. 9.

an issue with a small tetrastyle temple on the reverse similar to that on Charlemagne's type 4 denarii.⁹³

Louis II produced several types of coin in Benevento. Firstly a series of joint issues with Adelchis, all of which have LVDO/VVICV/P written in three lines of large letters across the obverse field; on the reverse various circumscriptions such as ARHANG MIHAEL (with P/ADEL/R written across the field in three lines⁹⁴) or another series bears the reverse legend ADELHICPRINCE[p]S.⁹⁵ Another series replaced the ruler portrait with the abstract image of an eight-armed cross or star whose significance is unclear, circumscribed by LVDOVVICVS IIPE, with BENEVENTV CIBI on the reverse around another image of a temple.⁹⁶

The former of these two coins also has a curious image on the obverse instead of the star/cross. This has been variously interpreted as a flower, a trumpet or a cornucopia.⁹⁷ To the best of my knowledge it is totally unlike any other Carolingian or Beneventan coin except the denarius of Grimoald IV [above] which depicted what was clearly intended to be some kind of vegetal form on the obverse.⁹⁸ This type was briefly revived under Radelchis in the 840s⁹⁹ and Louis's coin may be a continuation of this.

Louis placed Angilberga's name on at least some Beneventan coins. There were basically four issues¹⁰⁰: 1) the *dominus* series, presents the imperial couples' names prefaced by the title *dominus/a*, thus on the obverse the circumscription read DOM

⁹³CNI XVIII, p. 183, nos. 20-8; tav. VII, 31, even described in the catalogue as 'tempietto carolingio con crocetta'.

⁹⁴CNI XVIII, p. 184, no. 30, 31; tav. VIII, 1.

⁹⁵Morrison & Grunthal, CC, p. 260, no. 1180; pl. XXXVII.

⁹⁶Morrison & Grunthal, CC, p. 259, nos. 1172-4; pl. XXXVII; CNI XVIII, p. 184, nos. 32-3; tav. VIII, no. 2 (although the temple is very hard to discern from the illustration).

⁹⁷Grierson & Blackburn, MEC I, p. 71, 'a flower design, an ear of corn between two ivy leaves. Its significance is unknown.'

⁹⁸I Longobardi, p. 174, no. IV. 40. Note that the photograph of this coin has the obverse and reverse incorrectly labelled.

⁹⁹CNI XVIII, tav. VII, nos. 21-2.

¹⁰⁰I have considered only issues which changed iconography and have discounted minor variations in the legend such as variant spellings of names e.g. CNI XVIII, pp. 186-7, nos. 51-2, 'Angilperga' instead of 'Angilberga'.

LVDVICVS and on the reverse DMA ANGILBERGA, and both sides of the coin bore a monogram of IMP, the M and P usually ligatured;¹⁰¹

2) used a monogram of the letters A, G, U, S (for *Augustus*) circumscribed by LUDOVICUS IMP on the obverse, and with AGU/STA in two lines in the reverse field circumscribed by ANGILBERGA IMP¹⁰²; [see above]

3) retained on one side of the coin the Beneventan cross-on-steps traditional on gold coins (even though the coin was a silver denarius) circumscribed by LVDOVICVS INP and on the other side ANGIL/BERGA/INP written in three lines across what one editor at least regarded as the obverse field.¹⁰³

4) in a variation on type 3 (or perhaps type 3 is a variation on type 4) had the same iconography and legends as type 3 but a small cross in the field instead of Angilberga's name.¹⁰⁴

The difficulty of distinguishing obverse from reverse in these issues is intriguing. Ideologically the obverse of Carolingian and Beneventan coins traditionally carried the ruler's name. However it would probably be wrong to put too much emphasis on this. The placing of Angilberga's name and title on the 'obverse' may be due to a blurring of the distinction between the iconographical 'content' of reverse and obverse on Beneventan coins. The cross-on-steps was the traditional symbol on the reverse of Beneventan gold coins while the ruler's name appeared on the obverse. However the coin with Angilberga's name in the field combines on the same side of the coin the typical obverse legend of Louis's name and title circumscriptional around the typical reverse image of the cross-on-steps. It's difficult to decide which of these elements should be used to determine which side of the coin is the reverse and which the obverse. Regrettably cataloguers have not been consistent. Morrison & Grunthal decided that the ruler's name marked the obverse;

¹⁰¹CNI XVIII, p. 185, nos. 38-40; tav. VIII, 5.

¹⁰²CNI XVIII, pp. 186-7, nos. 47-54; tav VIII, 8.

¹⁰³I Longobardi, pp. 176-7, no. IV. 50, b. Also illustrated in CNI XVIII, p. 185, no. 41; tav VIII, 6.

¹⁰⁴CNI XVIII, p. 185, nos. 42-7; tav. VIII, 7.

Arslan¹⁰⁵ decided that the cross-on-steps constituted the reverse. When both elements appear together, as on the Angilberga issue, these criteria conflict. These problems make it difficult to know which side of these coins is the obverse and which the reverse. As noted earlier Beneventan silver coins had always been more iconographically varied than the gold issues; this uncertainty may derive from the lack of any definite traditions to fall back on.

The reference to Angilberga as *Augusta* is particularly interesting. It is unique on Carolingian coinage. However Roman emperors's wives were often referred to as *augusta* until about the middle of the sixth century. The title was usually bestowed when the empress produced a male heir. It was commonly used on late Roman coins and sometimes a portrait of the empress was included too.¹⁰⁶ It is tempting to assume that Angilberga's title was a revival of this late-antique practice but it seems unlikely for several reasons. No imperial (or royal consort) in Western Christendom had used the title since Justinianic times; even in the East after the seventh century it had only been used once, by an improbable model, Irene, from 792-7.¹⁰⁷ Unlike her late antique predecessors Angilberga never gave birth to a son. If imperial practice was being followed at least approximately perhaps its use coincided with the birth of the first imperial child, a daughter, but this remains conjecture. However the description of an empress as *augusta* in the Carolingian period was not wholly without precedents: Lothar I's wife Ermingard (Louis II's mother) was occasionally referred to as *augusta* in charters.¹⁰⁸ The title's first use on documents concerning Angilberga was in 864¹⁰⁹ and this is favoured by Bougard as its date of

¹⁰⁵I Longobardi, p. 176-7, no. IV b.

¹⁰⁶K. G. Holum, *Theodosian Empresses: Women and Imperial Dominion in Late Antiquity*, (Los Angeles, London, 1982), pp. 28-33, esp. nn. 88-90, pp. 30-1 & n. 96, p. 33.

¹⁰⁷Grierson, *Byzantine Coins*, pp. 158, 152; p. 166 notes that Irene's coins did circulate in Sicily however; I presume they therefore *might* have reached north Italy.

¹⁰⁸DLo, no. 106, pp. 251-3, at 252 l.29 (849 Sept. 6) ...*coniux nostra Hirmengarda augusta*...; also possibly no. 90, pp. 216-23 (845 May 15 Strasbourg) at 221 l. 26-7 but the document is lacunose and the title depends on the editor's reconstruction of the text.

¹⁰⁹DLII no. 40, pp. 146-7, l.11-12 (Nov. 3, Orcho)...*Engilberga nobis amantissima coniux augusta nostram*...

introduction to coincide with the introduction of the *consors regni* title.¹¹⁰ However there is only one other certain use of the title for Angilberga during Louis's lifetime¹¹¹ so the use of the term is hardly attested more frequently for Angilberga than for earlier Carolingian empresses. The use of the title on the coinage is unique however. If Louis and Angilberga's coinage was based on earlier models (for which there is no direct evidence) it was looking back at least three centuries. Of course the same was true of the imperial title itself and Charlemagne's *xpictiana religio* issue may have been modelled on a Constantinian medal¹¹² so the idea is not unfeasible; however the re-use of the *Augusta* title in the very different context of the ninth century makes it difficult to extrapolate from late antique practice. Given Angilberga's uniquely important role as an imperial consort the *Augusta* title may have been consciously intended to reinforce her position by presenting her as quite simply the female *Augustus*. Conversely however, Angilberga never issued charters in her own right during Louis's lifetime: like other Carolingian consorts she always appears only as an intercessor for others.

However as a final comment on the coin with 'Angilberga' in the field one would note that its script type is superficially similar to that used for the mint name on several north Italian Carolingian coins (such as Milan, Pavia and Lucca)¹¹³ and the effect is not dissimilar to the Charlemagne type 2 denarii. Perhaps the iconographical precedents for the coin are Carolingian rather than late-Roman. In this case it would probably be wrong to look for a single model for the series.

Morrison and Grunthal consider several other silver issues with Louis's and Angilberga's names on them to come from indeterminate mints, although the *CNI* probably correctly considers them Beneventan¹¹⁴ since they bear a cross-on-steps, although on the

¹¹⁰Bougard, 'Engelberga', *DBI* 42 (1993), pp. 668-76 at 670.

¹¹¹*DLII* no. 46, pp. 157-8, at 158, l.9 (866, July 4 Capua).

¹¹²Grierson & Blackburn, *MEC* p. 200.

¹¹³See the illustrations in Morrison & Grunthal, *CC*, pl. XVII, nos. 447, 451, 454.

¹¹⁴*CNI* XVIII, nos. 30-1, 34-5, 38-54, pp. 184-6. Grierson, *Numismatic Chronicle* 1969, pp. 348-9 on indeterminate mints.

obverse rather than the reverse.¹¹⁵ The coins do not refer to Adelchis or Benevento directly but since by this time the cross-on-steps had not been used on any north Italian coinage for almost two centuries a northern origin is implausible. In comparison to the north Italian denarii of Lothar I or the later Carolingians they are also badly underweight¹¹⁶ particularly when one recalls that although north Italian coins became thinner and wider their weight was stable.¹¹⁷ However these coins fit the weights of Beneventan coinage closely.

In this context difficulties have arisen concerning a denarius attributed to Louis II. It was found in Starydworek, Poland (formerly Althösch) in the mid-nineteenth century, when it was first attributed to Louis II.¹¹⁸ The *CNI* attributed the coin to Benevento¹¹⁹ although Morrison and Grunthal inexplicably consider its mint unknown.¹²⁰ The matter has never been discussed in print, however the evidence for a Beneventan attribution is compelling. On the reverse the coin has the standard Carolingian *Xpistiana religio* legend around a cross flanked by A and Ω and on the obverse the legend +II/LVDO/-VVICV/P: across the field in 5 lines. The use of alpha and omega (or any Greek letters) on late Carolingian coins is unique but is frequent on Beneventan coins. The form of Louis's title found on this coin also survives on an issue produced with Adelchis of Benevento although the reverse of that coin is quite different with an inscription to the archangel

¹¹⁵Morrison & Grunthal, *CC*, nos. 1177-8, p. 259.

¹¹⁶Morrison & Grunthal only give the weight (in grammes) of examples of no. 1178 [see previous note] as follows: 1.1, 1.11, 1.14, 0.92, 0.78, mean = 1.01 gr. The average weight of Lothar's denarii, (Morrison & Grunthal, *CC*, pp. 166-7) seems very substantially heavier. Louis II's certainly Beneventan silver issues for which weights are given (*CC*, nos. 1173-4, p. 259) fit the '1178' issue average: 0.87, 0.88, 0.97, 1.02, mean = 0.925 gr well within the 0.2 gr variation Grierson & Blackburn, *MEC* I, p. 194, regard as normal. The average weight of Louis II's Beneventan coins is even closer to that of the 1178 issues if we include Morrison & Grunthal, *CC*, no. 1180, which I suggested above was also Beneventan: 1.05 gr, new average = 0.952 gr. I thus think it very likely that 1178 is a Beneventan issue.

¹¹⁷Grierson & Blackburn, *MEC* I, p. 252.

¹¹⁸T. Friedlander, 'Der Fund von Althösch', *Münzstudien* [= *Hannoversche Numismatische Zeitschrift*] VIII (1877), pp. 267-300 at 288-9, nos. 123, 124.

¹¹⁹*CNI* XVIII, p. 185, no. 34; tav. VIII, no. 3.

¹²⁰Morrison & Grunthal, *CC*, no. 1182, p. 260.

Michael.¹²¹ Moreover the type of cross on the reverse (with a long descender and short arms) is very similar to that used on other Beneventan coins and most dissimilar to the equal-armed version used on north-Italian Carolingian coins.¹²² This all strongly suggests a Beneventan origin.

This attribution is especially interesting because the coin was found so far into Slavic territory and in a curious hoard context. The hoard contains Islamic coins from as early as the seventh century although also some from the late ninth and early tenth centuries but its burial occurred after c. 1016.¹²³ If the dating of the 'Louis II' piece is correct it is the earliest Christian coin in the hoard by at least half a century (the next oldest is of Boleslaw I (938-67)). The other Italian coins in the hoard are all from Otto III's reign and the hoard's general structure, except for the Louis II and Islamic coins, suggests the second half of the tenth- and the early eleventh century.¹²⁴ The Islamic issues presumably took longer to penetrate the presumably relatively poorly-monetized Slavic territories and are probably of little significance for dating Christian pieces in the same hoard. Perhaps the Louis II piece continued to circulate until the very late tenth century and travelled with the other Italian coins.

Finally, Arslan has attempted to calculate the number of dies in use for each of the issues of Beneventan coinage between the late seventh century and c. 900. One has misgivings about the reliability of the figures produced (as does Arslan himself)¹²⁵ and about the possibility that new finds might radically change the picture he presents but if

¹²¹Morrison & Grunthal, *CC*, no. 1181, p. 260, also inexplicably regarded as indeterminate despite the reference in the reverse field to P(rinceps)/ADEL(chis)/R; likewise p. 260, no. 1180. Again cf *CNI* XVIII, p. 184, nos. 30-1.

¹²²E.g. *CNI* XVIII, tav. VII, nos. 25, 29, 32.

¹²³T. Kiersnowska, 'Monnaies Carolingiennes sur les Terres Slaves', *Wiadomosci Numizmatyczne (Polish Numismatic News)* V (1961), pp. 90-9, at p. 96 no. 23 (not no. 10 as Morrison & Grunthal, *CC*, no. 219, p. 400); catalogued Morrison & Grunthal, no. 1182, p. 260.

¹²⁴Friedlander, 'Althörschen', pp. 289f, esp. p. 283 [Boleslaw]; p. 294-7 [Islamic coins]; pp. 293-4 [Italian coins].

¹²⁵Arslan, 'Sequenze', p. 396. Moreover note that he sometimes gives die numbers with a margin of error of as much as 50 % ! Cf. T. V. Buttrey, 'Calculating Ancient Production II: Why It Cannot Be Done', *NC* 154 (1994), pp. 341-52 for a critique of the method. Below pp. nn. 167-8.

correct it is very interesting. His figures suggest that, although they were fairly short, the periods when the Carolingians directly-influenced the Beneventan mint produced very large numbers of dies¹²⁶ and hence presumably large volumes of coin. A reconsideration of surviving examples in museums allows Arslan to argue that gold coins of Grimoald III with Charlemagne, which had been thought rare, were in fact quite common.¹²⁷ I would argue that this may show that the Carolingians were keen to emphasize their authority in Benevento by striking large volumes of coin bearing their names and titles, which is why the brief periods of Carolingian dominance have produced evidence of so many dies in operation. However Arslan also feels that the large number of coins struck under Angilberga and Louis II could not have been produced in the short period usually allowed, 870-1.¹²⁸ Perhaps we should extend Carolingian influence over Benevento's coins back to at least 866 and possibly even back to 858 - there are after all no gold coins known from Adelchis's reign at all. This might make the volumes of Carolingian coins from Benevento rather less dramatic.

Venice: The Venetian mint had an altogether more ambiguous relationship with Carolingian authority. Its operation cannot be ascertained before c. 820. Despite being a nominally Byzantine province it produced coins close to Carolingian ones in style and weight. As the Beneventan episodes above emphasize the striking of money was a delicate matter. The legends on the Venetian coins complicate matters. Venice never formally acknowledged Carolingian supremacy in any of the agreements reached in the ninth century. On the contrary the arrangement of 812 placed Venice outside Carolingian territory.¹²⁹ This situation is believed to have continued thereafter. It is therefore of great interest that Venetian moneyers working in a territory never formally under Carolingian control, struck issues on the Carolingian model, including the crucial 'constitutional' use of

¹²⁶Arslan, 'Sequenze', p. 396, table.

¹²⁷Arslan, 'Sequenze', p. 394.

¹²⁸Arslan, 'Sequenze', p. 405.

¹²⁹G. De Vergottini, 'Venezia e l'istria nell'Alto Medioevo', *Storia della Civiltà Veneziana*, (Florence, 1979) vol. I, p. 74.

the Carolingian ruler's name. In this context down to the end of Carolingian rule in Italy Venice produced two significant issues. One bore the ambiguous legend DNS CUNSERVA ROMA NP without the name of any ruler; the other bore either Lothar I's name or the name of an emperor Louis.¹³⁰ Venetian historians and numismatists have been quick to discount the suggestion that these coins indicated anything substantive about Venice's status vis-à-vis the Carolingian world¹³¹ despite the fact that the Carolingians obviously thought it important in Benevento. Part of the problem is, again, the dating of these coins. The 'Lothar' coin presumably dates from 840-55. The DN CUNSERVA ROMA NP issue however can be dated only by hoard evidence. It was previously believed to be from the time of Louis II¹³² but more recently has been attributed to the last years of Louis the Pious's reign, presumably on the basis of its find pattern. But this is difficult. Morrison & Grunthal's catalogue lists this Venetian coin-type (no. 456) as known from nine finds. Two of these were single finds,¹³³ two more were too badly catalogued to be of use for dating purposes.¹³⁴ Another hoard containing a 456 type coin has no other Carolingian coins in it, making an assessment of its date of deposition contentious.¹³⁵ Dating the 456 series therefore depends on the hoards from Veuillin, Belvézet, Dorestadt (1846), and Ide. The Dorestadt and Ide hoards cover a long range including coins of Charles the Bald and Lothar II¹³⁶ but the Belvézet hoard contains no coins later than Louis

¹³⁰Morrison & Grunthal, CC, nos. 455-8, p. 147 (n. 455 appears to be a forgery); illustrated by N. Papadopoli, *Le Monete di Venezia*, (Venice, 1893), pp. 49-50, cf. pp. 20-2.

¹³¹E.g. F. C. Lane & R. C. Mueller, *Money and Banking in Medieval and Renaissance Venice*, vol. I *Coins and Moneys of Account*, (London, Baltimore, 1985), p. 107; Ortalli, *SVenezia* I, p. 748; Papadopoli, *Monete*, pp. 14-16 rehearses the 'campanilistico' early nineteenth century idea that these Venetian coins were struck by the Carolingians *in palatio* (!), an idea now decisively rejected.

¹³²Papadopoli, *Monete*, pp. 21-2.

¹³³Morrison & Grunthal, CC, n. 177, p. 394 (Boppard 1915); n. 178, p. 394 (Neümunster-Grotenkamp 1954).

¹³⁴Morrison & Grunthal, CC, n. 209, p. 398 (Regensburg 1901 - the report simply says the find 'contained coins of a king Louis' [sic]); n. 231, pp. 402-3 (Schowen, Netherlands, - collected between 1900-25 on an occasional basis without record of the circumstances of the finds).

¹³⁵Morrison & Grunthal, CC, n. 22, p. 346 (Hermences, 1921).

¹³⁶Morrison & Grunthal, CC, nos. 18, pp. 345-6, & n. 52, pp. 355-6. The authors state, without explaining why, that the presence of coins of Charles the Bald in the Dorestadt find is 'dubious'. If correct this find would reinforce the dating based on the Belvézet hoard [see above].

the Pious, hence I presume, the assumption that the DN CUNSERVA issue is from his reign. Hence also the presumption that the series mentioned above with an emperor Louis's name on it is of Louis the Pious also since it too survives from Belvézet.¹³⁷

Such a dating implies that Lothar's relationship with Venice may not have been stronger than that of his father. More plausibly however I suspect it merely shows that it was Venetian moneyers rather than Carolingian emperors who decided what appeared on Venice's coins. This would accord with the 'arm's length' Veneto-Carolingian relationship described in other sources. Neither Louis the Pious nor Lothar appears to have made any attempt to interfere in Venetian internal politics.¹³⁸ Lothar did however issue the earliest surviving treaty with Venice, the *pactum Lotharii* of 841.¹³⁹ This is the first surviving document to treat Venice as an independent entity rather than a Byzantine dependency, as it had been, at least officially, in 812,¹⁴⁰ although it probably does not represent the moment of Venetian independence from Constantinople but rather an important milestone on the way.¹⁴¹ The currency is not specifically mentioned but it seems not unreasonable in some way to associate its change, perhaps retrospectively, with the relationship established in the treaty. The Beneventan material discussed above emphasizes that the format of coins could be a politically-charged issue for the Carolingians. Extrapolating from this one might imagine the same to be true in the Venetian context; however it would be easy to overestimate Carolingian power in the lagoon, which never seems to have taken any substantive form. Venice maintained an ambivalent relationship with both Franks and Greeks. In 840 the doge accepted the Byzantine honorific *spatharios* and in the rest of the

¹³⁷Ortalli, *SVenezia*, p. 748 without supporting evidence. Morrison & Grunthal, *CC*, no. 456, p. 147 comes from Belvézet.

¹³⁸Ortalli, *SVenezia* I, p. 746.

¹³⁹*MGH Cap.* II, no. 233, pp. 130-5.

¹⁴⁰The treaty has been the subject of many works: H. Kretschmayr, *Geschichte von Venedig* vol. I, p. 96; R. Cessi, 'Le Origini del Ducato Veneto', *ASVeneto* ser. V, (1928-9) pp. 175-321, is fundamental; G. Röscher, *Venedig und das Reich. Handels- und Verkehrspolitische Beziehungen in der deutschen Kaiserzeit*, (Tübingen, 1982), pp. 3-8, 28-9 presents an unsatisfactory recent synthesis since it focuses later; Ortalli, *SVenezia* pp. 742-6 is to be preferred, who p. 784 n. 108 notes that Cessi's views are 'le piu affidabili' but 'la questione non è chiusa'. Krahwinkel, *Friaul*, pp. 248-50 offers nothing new.

¹⁴¹Ortalli, in *SVenezia*, pp. 746-8.

decade he supplied Venetian ships for Byzantine campaigns in the southern Adriatic.¹⁴² Although in 856 Louis II acted as spiritual godfather to John, doge Peter Tradonico's grandson,¹⁴³ I do not think this represents any clearcut concession of authority, much less an indication of real power. It is perhaps better regarded as a ritual stabilization of good relations. Symbolically, following John's murder in 864 some of those responsible were sent 'to Francia' but others to Constantinople.¹⁴⁴

The issue of Carolingian-type coins should therefore not be associated with any real Carolingian power in Venice but rather as an indication of the proximity to Venice of a far more powerful neighbour but also of the accommodation reached between the two parties. Note also that despite the hard evidence for Louis II's close relations with the Venetians no other coins bearing the name of an outside ruler are known for his reign or for any later north Italian rulers until the Salian era.¹⁴⁵ It is possible that all these coins come from Peter Tradonico's reign as doge. Presumably then these 'Carolingian' Venetian coins indicate a willingness on the part of at least this doge to be presented as a subordinate without there being any substantive Carolingian involvement in Venice. Indeed when Peter was murdered in 864 no Carolingian intervention followed.¹⁴⁶ No coins of this type are known hereafter.

Circulating Medium: When, probably in 781, he reformed the coinage of the Lombard kingdom Charlemagne shifted the focus of north Italy's currency from a gold standard to a silver one.¹⁴⁷ Quite apart from the economic aspects of this decision it also

¹⁴²Giovanni Diacono, *Cronaca Veneziana*, (FSI 9; Rome, 1899), pp. 113-14; Ortalli, *SVenezia*, p. 742 with refs. On naval war: Eickhoff, *Seekrieg*, p. 184. Note in order to distinguish the Venetian author from the John the Decon who wrote the *GEN* I refer to the former by the Italian version of his name.

¹⁴³Giovanni Diacono, *Cronaca Veneziana*, p. 116; Ortalli, *SVenezia*, p. 746.

¹⁴⁴Giovanni Diacono, *Cronaca Veneziana*, pp. 117, l. 13f. to 118, ll. 11; Ortalli, *SVenezia*, p. 746.

¹⁴⁵CONRADUS IMPERATOR: Papadopoli, *Monete*, pp. 49f, esp. 53; Rösch, *Venedig*, p. 12, n. 19. I have alluded above to the difficulty of distinguishing Louis the Pious's coins from Louis II's but coin hoard evidence make it improbable that any of the coins discussed here are of Louis II.

¹⁴⁶Ortalli, *SVenezia*, p. 746.

¹⁴⁷Lombard royal silver coins had been struck in small volumes but had petered out c.700: P. Grierson, 'The Silver Coinage of the Lombards', *Archivio Storico Lombardo* 8a ser., VI (1956), pp. 130-40 [repr. in *Dark Age Numismatics* no. XIV].

put an end to Italy's distinction as the only territory, except Byzantium, based on a gold currency. Henceforth in the West only Benevento adhered to this standard and even there Grimoald III introduced silver coins¹⁴⁸ for the first time - possibly the result both of silver's economic primacy in the West and of Frankish pressure linked to events around 787-92.

These shifts of medium cannot but be of significance, as I have tried to indicate at various points. Charlemagne's introduction of silver coinage was the most important change in the north Italian currency of the early medieval period. Quite apart from the conscious breaking of previous numismatic traditions it must have triggered a sudden and sharp increase in the need for silver bullion. Clearly therefore the nature of the circulating medium conveyed its own ideological message. Benevento's retention of a gold coinage throughout the ninth century can only have been an ideological choice since those Arab and Carolingian territories with which it traded most intensely used silver currency. The Beneventan gold coins declined drastically in purity from c. 75% in the seventh century to 50% under Arichis to barely 35% under Sicard (817-35). (This decline seems to have continued under Radelchis for whom the sole example is c. 25% gold, although extrapolating from so small a sample is difficult.)¹⁴⁹ This presumably indicates a steady economic decline for the principality which was increasingly outflanked by coastal merchant towns like Salerno and Amalfi. The conversion of Benevento to an entirely silver currency under Adelchis II (and presumably Louis II played a crucial role in this shift) was the final acknowledgment of this fact.¹⁵⁰

I have mentioned above Aistulf's striking of coins in Ravenna, and Charlemagne's unwillingness to issue gold coins until Byzantium had confirmed his title. Under Louis the Pious special gold coins were struck, essentially similar to normal gold issues but much heavier, possibly to be used as commemorative medallions modelled on late Roman

¹⁴⁸*J Longobardi*, p. 173, IV. 37 & IV. 39.

¹⁴⁹W. A. Oddy 'Analysis of the Gold Coinage of Benevento', *NC* 14 (1974), pp. 78-109, at 87-9; Grierson & Blackburn, *MEC* I, p. 72.

¹⁵⁰Thus Arslan, 'Sequenze', p. 407.

ones.¹⁵¹ Equally striking is the attempt in Benevento to co-opt the local gold currency to carry the Carolingian 'message'.

Currency and the Economy: Despite the various difficulties of interpretation of certain specific coin types and the need for further research, particularly about Louis II, the essential pattern of the Carolingian use of coins seems clear. Under Charlemagne it developed as the ruler's own power did. Charlemagne's government carried out several major reforms of the currency which resulted in a complete break with earlier practice. From the point of view of the later Carolingians however it was not Charlemagne's models which were of lasting importance but the introduction by Louis the Pious of a new coinage (and a new imperial title)¹⁵² which in Italy formed the basis of the imperial currency and titulature for the rest of the Carolingian era. If this can be interpreted as in any way an ideological statement it probably indicates a traditionalist approach to titles and the currency which harked back to earlier Carolingian traditions. This might equally represent administrative inertia but this seems unlikely given, for example, Charles the Bald's willingness to reform his coinage, albeit also in line with earlier Carolingian models.¹⁵³ Also one should not discount an element of naming chance. Charles the Bald returned to Charlemagne's monogram and currency type largely in an effort to present himself as the new 'Carolus'.¹⁵⁴ In Italy Louis II preferred to invoke his own Carolingian namesake. If Lothar I's imperial heir had been named differently it might have produced a different outcome. However, given the names of the later Carolingians, a further point is that Italian sources such as Andreas of Bergamo, are powerfully positive in their depiction of Louis the Pious.¹⁵⁵ It may well be that Louis II was trying to tap into this image of a good Carolingian ruler; in this case he would have derived ideological benefits to which modern

¹⁵¹Grierson, 'La Date des Monnaies d'Or de Louis le Pieux', *Moyen Age* ser.4, 18 (1966) pp. 67-74 [repr. in *Dark Age Numismatics* no. XXIII]; cf Morrison & Grunthal, *CC*, pp. 28-31 takes up the argument again.

¹⁵²H. Wolfram, 'Herrschartitel', *Intitulatio* II, p. 172.

¹⁵³Grierson & Blackburn, *MEC* I, p. 228-35.

¹⁵⁴Nelson, *Charles the Bald*, pp. 208-9 on Pîtres; cf 223-4 for the use of the Carolus idea in the late 860s.

¹⁵⁵See ch. II.

historians, until very recently dazzled by the assumption that Charlemagne was the only model Frankish ruler, have been blind.

Lastly there are several crucial questions related to the way the coinage circulated and hence how it might have operated as an ideological vehicle. To solve these problems involves considering the coinage not only ideologically but also economically. We can moreover generally approach these problems only by generalizing from regional studies. Nevertheless impressionistically the results are impressive. The argument is not straightforward and can be best approached by considering the work of two historians, Bernareggi for Italy and some of Stafford's suggestions concerning the tenth century Anglo-Saxon currency. The latter is illuminating by analogy and serves to bring out some of the implications of Bernareggi's conclusions.

Stafford's theorizing concerning die production under Aethelred II is relevant on three points. As in Lombard and Carolingian Italy, English mints were all notionally controlled by the monarch. Unlike Italian coins however, Anglo-Saxon moneyers' names often appeared on the reverse of English coins. It is thus possible to track their production. Stafford notes, firstly that the great burgeoning of mints in the late tenth/early eleventh century 'went far beyond economic necessity' and suggests that, since many mints were on sites for payment of renders to the king, they may have been established (presumably on a temporary basis) to convert these renders into cash for use by the monarch at a time of necessity. Secondly, she shows that mints were often staffed by moneyers from an adjacent minting centre. Thirdly, she suggests that since currency reforms were costly to the moneyer (who had to acquire new dies and lost the income from selling his own dies to local centres) perhaps the only way to enforce these reforms was to offer a share of the profits to local rulers. Hence she concludes with a set of questions also of considerable relevance to this debate:

'Such facts must raise the question of whether every place whose name appears on a coin was a permanent mint; whether many of them were economically unnecessary and opened only

occasionally and for specific purposes...If some mints were regularly supplied from other centres should they be regarded as mints or rather as places from which moneyers occasionally worked ? Who controlled the moneyer...?'¹⁵⁶

These questions become extremely significant in the context of Bernareggi's work, the only major attempt to consider the early medieval Italian coinage as a part of an economic and governmental whole. In a series of studies he built up an argument around Desiderius's currency in the last two decades of the Lombard kingdom. Desiderius's Tuscan-type tremisses are known only from the Ilanz hoard, in which there survive 29 examples.¹⁵⁷ Traditionally it was believed that Desiderius introduced these coins fairly early in his reign and probably by c. 760. This assumption was presumably based on their greater rate of survival - more surviving coins implies more coins generally; not in itself a very safe argument. However Bernareggi's inspection of these coins has led him to argue that several of them, although with a different mint name on the reverse, shared the same obverse die.¹⁵⁸ In the context of Stafford's questions this is obviously a phenomenally important conclusion. Bernareggi has hence suggested that all Desiderius's Tuscan-type tremisses were struck very close together in time (and presumably in space since they share a die). He argues on the basis of the legend on the coins (FLAVIA plus a city name) that they were struck to record the concession to the towns of the Po valley of some form of civic autonomy comparable to that which he claims was devolved to Tuscany by Liutprand¹⁵⁹ and which he associates with the introduction of this coin-type in Tuscany in the 730s. This is because the title *Flavius* was used by the Lombard kings.¹⁶⁰ Moreover,

¹⁵⁶P. Stafford, 'Historical Implications of the Regional Production of dies Under Aethelred II', *British Numismatic Journal* XLVIII (1978), pp. 35-51 esp. 38-41; quotes from 39, 40.

¹⁵⁷Bernareggi, *Il Sistema*, p. 103.

¹⁵⁸Bernareggi, *Il Sistema*, p. 108; Bernareggi, 'Struttura Economica e Monetazione del Regno Longobardo', *Quaderni Ticinesi di Numismatica e Antichità Classiche* V (1976), pp. 331-76 at 366; Bernareggi, 'Ilanz', pp. 132-3.

¹⁵⁹On the devolution of civic autonomy: Bernareggi, 'Struttura', pp. 361-3. An early version of this theory was proposed by U. Gualazzini, 'Aspetti Giuridici dei Problemi Monetari in Italia durante l'Alto Medioevo', *Moneta e Scambi nell'Alto Medioevo*, (SSpol VIII, 1960; publ. 1961), pp. 89-121 at 115-116.

¹⁶⁰On the *flavius* title, Wolfram, *Intitulatio* I, pp. 64-7.

Bernareggi then continues that the whole series of Desiderius's Tuscan-type tremissi must have been struck together, dates the production of this series to 773-4 and interprets it as a bid for support from the Po valley towns by Desiderius in the teeth of the Carolingian invasion.¹⁶¹

There are many problems with this theory. The only aspect of it which is not open to criticism (at least not without closely examining the Ilanz coins) is Bernareggi's claim that these tremisses shared obverse dies. His very specific interpretation of the rather vague iconography of the series seems implausible and is not supported by any other evidence.¹⁶² Moreover there is only one surviving specimen of a non-Tuscan type coin from Desiderius's reign.¹⁶³ If Bernareggi is correct to associate the Tuscan-type coins with the final crisis of the Lombard kingdom in 773-4 this means accepting that the production of the sixteen years of Desiderius's reign between 757-773 are fully represented by this single coin and that the very much more numerous Tuscan-type coins represent the product of just a few months around the end of 773 and early 774; this too seems a little unlikely although Bernareggi tries to get around the problem by suggesting Desiderius demonetized all his surviving coins to produce the Tuscan-type issue.¹⁶⁴ If so this was a remarkably effective demonetization, especially since he argues this took place in response to the Frankish invasion.

Leaving aside the question of the meaning of the coins, their shared dies pose problems reminiscent of Stafford's Anglo-Saxon ones. If coins with 'Bergamo' and 'Milan' on the reverse shared the same die were they struck in those towns at all? Bernareggi states that 'regardless of the placename they bear, they were struck in the same town'.¹⁶⁵ Perhaps one

¹⁶¹Bernareggi, *Il Sistema*, pp. 108-11; Bernareggi, 'Conclusioni sulle Diverse fasi della Monetazione Longobarda', *Rivista Italiana di Numismatica e Scienze Affini*, XIX, ser 5a, - LXXIII, (1971), pp. 135-55 at 145, 148-52; Bernareggi, 'Ilanz', pp. 129-31.

¹⁶²Grierson & Blackburn, *MEC* I, pp. 63-4: 'whether, as applied to cities, it [the format of the coins] had any specific constitutional meaning, relating either to the status or loyalty of the towns, or signifying a formal concession of minting rights, we cannot know'.

¹⁶³As Bernareggi, 'Conclusioni', pp. 148-9, esp. 148, rather sheepishly acknowledges.

¹⁶⁴Bernareggi, 'Conclusioni', pp. 148-9.

¹⁶⁵Quotation from Bernareggi, 'Ilanz', p. 132; the theory had earlier been advanced in 'Struttura', p. 366.

should say more specifically that they were struck by the same die. This die identification opens up all kinds of disturbing possibilities. City names on coins might tell us nothing at all about the real operation of mints. Bernareggi does not consider the possibility that the coins might have been struck where they say, but that the *die* might have travelled from town to town with the moneyer. Some mints are known from only a very small number of issues, such as Bergamo, Castel Seprio. Were these really mints or just, in Stafford's words, 'places at which moneyers worked' ? Italian coins do not record the moneyer's name so no analysis such as Stafford's is possible. Further, if any of the above is true can we take the mint attribution of Carolingian coins at face value? Might a centralized production have even been normal in early medieval Italy? Lastly if this was the case why retain town names at all? Particularly why retain only the name of two or three towns (principally Pavia and Milan) on our surviving examples? The simplest solution to the last problem is that these really *are* mint names - but this still leaves unresolved the problem of the shared die Tuscan-type coins.

What volume of coinage was available to carry messages ? If Arslan's calculations of Beneventan die numbers¹⁶⁶ are remotely correct¹⁶⁷ and if we assume that each die produced c. 2000 coins¹⁶⁸ then even the smallest series of Beneventan/Carolingian coins could have numbered several thousands of pieces; the largest series might have reached over one hundred thousand coins. When one considers that this is the product of just one mint controlled for only restricted periods by the Carolingians, the implications for the

¹⁶⁶Arslan, 'Sequenze', p. 396 & above pp. 191-2.

¹⁶⁷Classical numismatists have been debating the validity of such calculations recently: see the attack by Buttrey, 'Calculating'. I accept Buttrey's strictures concerning the unreliability of 'average' figures for coins per die and even whether the number of dies really relates to the number of coins at all. My point above about Benevento's coins is only to consider *very* approximately the *potential* size of the currency as an ideological vehicle.

¹⁶⁸The question of how many coins each die produced has been debated in the context of eight-century England: D. M. Metcalf, 'How Large was the Anglo-Saxon Currency ?' *Economic History Review* XVIII (1965), pp. 475-82 suggests a figure as high as 10, 000 coins per die; *contra* Grierson, 'The Volume of Anglo-Saxon Coinage', *Economic History Review* XX (1967), pp. 153-60. I have deliberately chosen a conservative estimate.

north Italian currency are impressive. (This is not to say this many coins *were* struck and hence were in circulation, only that minting on this scale was possible.)

If the volume of coinage was the first determinant of the success of the medium as a vehicle for ideological messages the message itself had then to be decided. Here two questions concerning governmental control of the iconography of coins and the economic function of coins become factors distinct from their ideological purpose. Who controlled the currency: moneyers, Carolingian monarchs or local rulers ? This problem, as we shall see below, is related to the nature of the audience. To answer this we must consider two distinct sets of problems, governmental and economic, which are in fact closely intertwined. The example of the introduction of silver denarii into Tuscany exposes some of the difficulties. On the basis of charter evidence Wickham has argued that although silver coin was introduced into the Po valley in 781, its arrival in Tuscany and central Italy took place later in the 790s, significantly after the introduction of the new heavier class 3 denarius. Although Wickham acknowledges that this might demonstrate 'southern conservatism' in the realm of currency, he concludes that the speed with which silver coins replaced gold ones suggests it was the result of deliberate government policy.¹⁶⁹ Day however has recently raised the possibility that the government's decision to introduce heavier silver coin c. 793 might itself be the mediated effect of just such 'southern conservatism'.¹⁷⁰ If there was resistance to a new currency (as perhaps in Tuscany and certainly in Benevento) this presumably affected the way messages were propagated by that medium.

Wickham's description of a rolling introduction of silver coinage and Day's conjecture that this might indeed reveal 'southern conservatism' pose all sorts of problems, most of which are insoluble. Why wait until much later to introduce silver denarii into Tuscany ?

¹⁶⁹C. Wickham, 'Economic and Social Institutions in Northern Tuscany in the Eighth Century', *Istituzioni Ecclesiastiche della Toscana Medioevale*, (Commissione Italiana per la storia delle Pievi e delle Parrocchie, Studi e Ricerche 1; Galatina, 1980), pp. 7-34 at 28-30.

¹⁷⁰W. R. Day, 'The Monetary Reform of Charlemagne and the Evolution of Money in Early Medieval Campania', *Early Medieval Europe* 6.1 (1997) pp. 25-46 at 27-9 & below p. 205.

Were such coins available in the area between 781 and c. 795 but not taken up by locals ? (Wickham implies that denarii simply weren't being struck in Tuscany). Does this mean moneyers consciously decided not to mint silver coins ? If the rest of the *regnum Italiae* used silver how could Tuscany trade with it ? Grierson dismissed the changes as merely terminological conservatism: might Wickham have actually identified only the final phasing out of tremisses which continued in use for local purposes (and are hence recorded in the charters he used) alongside silver for extra-regional use ? Would resistance in central Italy (Day's 'southern conservatism' argument) explain why the change in weight of the denarius affected all Carolingian territories, not just Italy ?¹⁷¹

Important though they are, most of these problems are currently insoluble. However it is nevertheless possible to consider something of the political significance of these numismatic changes. Toubert has noted that there are no reports of imperial or royal *missi* operating in the Sabina before 798, despite rich documentation.¹⁷² Both changes to the coinage and the despatch of *missi* were influenced by government. If one associates these facts it suggests that in the late 790s the Carolingian regime launched a concerted attempt to exercise much more profound political influence in Tuscany and Spoleto. This would make the effective imposition of the coinage part of a wider project. Note these governmental actions quickly followed Benevento's resistance to Carolingian authority, crystallized by c. 793. These acts may therefore have been designed to impose real Carolingian power on central Italy in preparation for further attempts on the principality. Hence Pippin of Italy's concerted campaigns against Benevento which took place in 800, 801, 802¹⁷³ - just after the governmental acts discussed above. The use of coin as part of a broader government programme demonstrates the centre's propagation of a government medium in the margins of the polity. In fact even though these actions took place within

¹⁷¹Contra Grierson, 'Money', pp. 528-30.

¹⁷²Toubert, *Structures*, II, pp. 1261-2. The arrival of *missi* does not seem to coincide with any other political change, e.g. new duke of Spoleto (Winigis held office from c.788-822: Hlawitschka, *Franken*, pp. 25, 27, 34.)

¹⁷³ARF a. 800-2, pp. 110, 111, 114, 117; Bertolini, 'Carlomagno', p. 657.

the *regnum Italiae*, they are rather similar to those of Charlemagne in Benevento: the despatch of *potentes* and the introduction of a new currency.¹⁷⁴

I should like to move back to a broader consideration of the ideological uses of coinage. However this is only possible within the context of the economic use of coin. Wickham's argument about the late introduction of silver coin is in the context of a more general one about the circulation and use of money. His comments are significant for a consideration of the ideological use of coin. He states that:

The Lombard kings, like the Roman emperors, were quite aware that money was usable for commercial and reciprocal purposes, and this suited them; but not because they were interested in encouraging trade; rather because every transaction involving such a clear royal symbol as a coin would underline royal supremacy. As this was a side-product it never reacted back on minting policy. There was no reason to make enough gold to make it [the economy] fully liquid, or any other metal at all. The presence or absence of coin in...Early Medieval society has nothing to do with the economic nature of the society; only with the concerns of its rulers.¹⁷⁵

Wickham goes on from this almost purely ideological interpretation of the coinage to emphasize the possibility that in the medieval era coin functioned as a social medium as much as an economic one.¹⁷⁶ The point is well-made, particularly for the mainly rural areas he considers. However the presence of so many different types of coin in the Venetian evidence below suggests that at least in major entrepôts (which were admittedly untypical of early medieval centres) coin *could* fulfill commercial functions. This opens the possibility that the production of coin would therefore have had to take account of economic requirements. A likely example of economic demands affecting the coinage is Benevento where the introduction of silver coin is certainly to be associated with Carolingian influence. Yet although Grimoald III's policy was to reject even the symbols

¹⁷⁴*Chronicon Salernitanum*, ed. Westerbergh, cc.23-5, pp. 27-8; Erchempert, c. 4, p. 236; Bertolini, 'Carlomagno', pp. 648-9.

¹⁷⁵Wickham, 'Economic', pp. 31-2.

¹⁷⁶Wickham, 'Economic', pp. 33-4.

of Carolingian domination, Benevento retained the most striking 'Carolingian' innovation, silver coins. I would suggest therefore that the retention of the silver coinage in Benevento after 793 can hardly be other than an economic measure. Day's suggestion of Tuscan conservatism bringing about the reform of the denarius in the 790s might be another example of economic influence on the form of the currency. Also from the 790s Offa's reform of his type III coins to bring them into line with the Charlemagne's class II denarius shows that the influence of economic/commercial factors on the coinage was not limited to Italy.¹⁷⁷ Thus although I would certainly accept Wickham's strictures that ruler's were relatively uninterested in trade I cannot agree that the form of the currency was entirely unrelated to the nature of the economy. This does not of course conflict with Wickham's suggestion that money might be a social medium.

The picture that thus emerges is very complicated. Presumably Tuscan resistance to the type 2 denarii introduced in 781 was predicated on so light a coin being economically unacceptable, hence the 793/4 introduction of a heavier denarius.¹⁷⁸ Likewise the post-792 success of the denarius in Benevento, which was a Carolingian innovation in the region, related not to its iconography but simply to the fact that it was useful. In these examples (at least possibly for Tuscany, certainly for Benevento) it was local 'markets' (whatever we mean by the term in this period, which is far from clear) and the regional economic functions of the currency which determined whether a coin was accepted as a medium of exchange and/or a store of value.

Venice is in this regard a particularly complex example. A huge hoard of 400 eighth-century Arab coins was discovered in 1592 under the church of S. Lorenzo and a small coin hoard uncovered in 1935 contained an Arab dirham and seven solidii of the Byzantine emperor Theophilus (829-42). These discoveries suggest that these coins circulated in

¹⁷⁷Grierson, 'Money', pp. 510-11. There is a certain irony in the fact that the Carolingian class II metrology with which the Mercian king had just harmonized his currency was almost immediately abandoned.

¹⁷⁸Thus implied by Day, 'Monetary Reform', pp. 27-9.

Venice at the same time that Venetian Carolingian denarii were being minted. Likewise the evocative discovery of a dirham and a denarius of Charlemagne fused together by oxidization inside the remains of a bag or purse has been seen as symbolic of Venice's trading links in the period.¹⁷⁹ In this regard the ideological significance of Venetian Carolingian coins is very much open to question. They begin to look like just one medium of exchange¹⁸⁰ amongst many in use in a vibrant trading centre - which rather tends to blunt their ideological importance. The same may well be true of Carolingian coins in the late eighth/early ninth century in central Italy which Wickham describes as 'almost a free currency zone'.¹⁸¹ We must once again return to the economic aspects of the coinage and once again are compelled to regard them as far more important than the ideological aspects of currency.

However for a coinage to even have the potential to operate like this it had to be available in the first place of course and this depended on moneyers. We know that Venetian 'Carolingian' issues were the product of only a fairly short period of some 25 years associated with a particular doge and I have suggested above that the late eighth-century Beneventan issues were organized by local moneyers¹⁸² and analogously that Tuscany clearly retained something of its numismatic individuality into the Carolingian period.¹⁸³ In the heartland of the *regnum* it is possible that the Treviso type III denarii were the product of a mint going its own way; if so this raises the possibility that even in this core region control of the mints may have been less absolute than it appears. Thus in some regions at least the Carolingians were working through only imperfectly controlled local ateliers. In regions not directly controlled by the Carolingians (Benevento, Venice, to some extent perhaps Tuscany too) the relationship between Carolingian political control

¹⁷⁹For all these examples see Ortalli, in *SVenezia* I, p. 748; illus. 749. I was unable to consult the works referred to in Ortalli's notes

¹⁸⁰See discussion above pp. 192-5 of the uses of coin.

¹⁸¹Wickham, 'Economic', p. 30.

¹⁸²Above pp. 198-203.

¹⁸³Above pp. 167-8, 205f.

and the format of the currency seems to have been quite direct. It is an interesting question whether the Carolingian coins from these areas were produced on the direct orders of the Carolingians to local moneyers or whether these orders were mediated via the local ruler. In Venice it looks very likely that the production of Venetian 'Carolingian' coins should be associated with the relationship between doge Peter Tradonico and the Carolingians. In large measure the willingness of such local rulers to have Carolingian iconography on their coins was probably dictated by their attitude towards having their 'public image' associated with the Carolingians. Paradoxically the less significance that local rulers attached to the concession of such symbols of authority, the more likely they were to allow them to appear. Venice adopted Carolingian type coins on a 'take-it-or-leave-it' basis reminiscent of the reported insouciance of Viking leaders who only appeared at Aachen for Easter assemblies because they got new clothes.¹⁸⁴ Recall that after 812 Carolingian influence in Venetian domestic politics appears to have completely ended. The concession of symbols of authority therefore seems to have been unimportant to doge Peter as long as Venice's independence was real. Conversely Grimoald of Benevento's rejection of Carolingian titles after 793 demonstrates how seriously he took these symbols of authority.¹⁸⁵

Control of the currency was a sign of power. The addition of the name of the Carolingian ruler to papal coins was undoubtedly some kind of sign of authority. Likewise ideologically it was no small achievement that the Carolingians succeeded in getting coins as controversial as Charlemagne's Beneventan series struck at all. But they did not directly control all of the Carolingian coins produced in places such as Venice and hence using them to analyze Carolingian intentions is difficult.

This all suggests that coins were a rather imperfect medium for ideological expression in the Carolingian period. Iconography could only be dealt with once metrology and

¹⁸⁴Notker Balbulus, *Gesta Karoli Magni*, ed. H. Haefele, (Berlin, 1959), ii 15.

¹⁸⁵In fact it shows the exact reverse of Smith's statement, '*Fines Imperii*', p. 187, that 'Grimoald knew injunctions to adopt Carolingian charter or coin forms were unlikely to be enforced with insistence'; witness the constant attacks on Benevento: *ARF* a. 800, 801, 802, pp. 110-11, 114, 117; cf. Bertolini, 'Carlo Magno', pp. 656-7.

circulating medium had been in effect 'agreed' between centre and periphery, in the case of Tuscany perhaps by the centre conforming to the periphery's expectations rather than vice versa. Since in a sense these coins were the product of 'negotiation' by the provinces (in the form of refusal to use the coins) one is tempted to use the nature of the resultant currency to reconstruct its audience. However because these changes are almost certainly the result of economic imperatives rather than ideological ones the 'audience' thus reconstructed is probably economic rather than ideological.

This is not to say that nothing can be deduced. If Arslan's calculations of Beneventan die numbers are correct then the Carolingians were concerned to ensure that their series were as widely-disseminated as possible. This implies an interest in reaching a wide audience. However, except in Benevento, the ideological reaction of this wider audience is unknown and even there the retention of silver coins after the end of effective Carolingian influence in 793 reveals that economic factors were at work too.

Crucial to the ideological efficacy of the coins is the question of what one might term 'numismatic literacy'. Would the general public (whatever that phrase means in this context) have appreciated the significance of changes to their currency? If the belief that Tuscany resisted the introduction of light early-Carolingian denarii is correct then clearly attention was paid to the metrology of the coin but this does not prove that the coin's iconography was significant. Italy was an area where public inscriptions must still have been frequent sights in the Carolingian era. In this sense it was a 'visual' society. But the evidence above suggests that it was a coin's economic rather than ideological value which really counted.

Thus although the coinage had the potential to reach a very wide audience ultimately the bulk of the evidence returns us to a consideration of the impact of the currency on the elite. The symbolic value of the coinage was presumably greatest in assemblies when the meaning of new coin issues could be spelled out to an elite audience or when the issue was

a novelty, just after its introduction.¹⁸⁶ This presumes that variations in the coinage affected the elite's perception of the Carolingians. But, if we thus believe that changes in the currency offer our best chance of understanding the elite's perceptions of the coinage then the elite of the *regnum Italiae* itself is almost entirely opaque because the Carolingians left the *regnum's* coinage was unaltered after c. 822. Currency changes did take place however on the periphery of the Carolingian Italian world hence the reactions of these elite audiences is more visible. Of course although inside the *regnum Italiae* the Carolingian government abandoned the currency as a dynamic medium of communication after 816, this is not to say that the coin ceased to convey a message, only that that message appears to be unvarying. In this regard the long term stability of the iconography of the north Italian coinage after 822 is significant. Between c. 690 and c. 822 the currency of the *regnum Langobardorum* had been altered in some way on average about every fifteen years.¹⁸⁷ The stabilization of the currency after this date may thus itself have conveyed a message of continuity, stability and government along traditional, well-established lines. Only in the regions outside Carolingian control were changes made to the coinage after 822. This regionalization of the ideological use of currency is undoubtedly because the Carolingians had other far more direct methods of communication within the kingdom of Italy. Generally after Charlemagne's reign the Carolingians did not seek to impose hegemony on the rest of Italy until Louis II's time. Venice's Carolingian series were probably not the product of Carolingian domination but the acknowledgement of formal good relations at a personal level between the doge and the Carolingians. Only in Benevento can one plausibly claim that the Carolingians imposed their coinage on the unwilling. This explains the famous resistance to these coins.

¹⁸⁶E.g. edict of Pîtres *MGH Cap.* II no. 273, cc. 8-24, pp. 311-28, which spells out the meaning of the new monogram and 'GDR' legend on the coins.

¹⁸⁷Grierson & Blackburn, *MEC* I, pp. 62-6 for an account of Lombard royal coins; 206-10 for Charlemagne's reign.

Finally, however, I should like to reiterate my misgivings about such attempts to read an audience or its reactions from our sources. Superficially it seems logical to assume that after c. 822 the very stability of the Carolingian north Italian currency itself conveyed a message of unvarying stability and governmental strength. We seem therefore to have finally penetrated an audience's perceptions. However, before we accept this idea too readily it is a useful corrective to reconsider Benevento's gold coinage. Across three hundred years from the late sixth to the late ninth centuries the iconography of Benevento's gold coins was almost totally unvarying: on the reverse a cross potent, on the obverse a frontal bust based on a late Roman emperor. By analogy with what I have said above about Carolingian coins this iconography ought to have conveyed a message of stability and continuity. Yet thanks to the unique documentation we possess from Benevento we know that by the last decade of the eighth century the currency had changed from being a symbol of Roman imperial authority to being a symbol of the independence of Benevento's rulers. From the point of view of extrapolating audience perceptions this is the most destructive example imaginable: a completely stable format totally changed its significance. We know this only because of our written sources. These south Italian gold coins represent almost perfect continuity in form yet their meaning was entirely discontinuous. They reveal something of the redundancy of the old 'continuity versus change' debate because these coins were the object of *both* fantastic stability across centuries *and* revolutionary change.¹⁸⁸ In the context of this thesis they show that even where iconography remained the same, its significance could change utterly. The implications for the reception of coins as ideological vehicles (perhaps for other types of sources too) scarcely need to be set out. What an audience saw we can state with absolute certainty; in lieu of other sources, however, what an audience perceived is a far more difficult problem.

¹⁸⁸Cf. the comments on the early medieval reinterpretation of ancient monuments and statues by M. McCormick, 'Texte, Images et Iconoclisme dans le Cadre des Relations entre Byzance et l'Occident Carolingien', *Testo e Immagine nell'Alto Medioevo (SSpol XLI, 1993; publ. 1994)*, pp. 95-158, at 103-4.

VI

Carolingian Capitularies in Italy

The corpus¹ of Carolingian capitulary legislation is very substantial (more than 700 folio pages), if one considers those general capitularies known from Italian manuscripts, about a fifth of it concerns Italy specifically. No Italian capitularies are known in any non-Italian manuscripts. Such legislation obviously offered the ruler an important mechanism for projecting his power very widely. The purpose of this chapter will therefore be to consider the role played by capitularies in the representation of the ruler and the perception of capitularies within the *regnum Italiae*.

Historiography: Although these Italian capitularies have been the subject of much historiographical attention, surprisingly little of it has treated the material either as a whole or in its Italian (rather than its Carolingian) context. The latter approach has sometimes been adopted by historians of jurisprudence, who however have generally regarded the period before 1000 as the barbarous prelude to the Bologna school's re-establishment of jurisprudence as a science.² Surprisingly even Ficker's grand work on law does no more than mention capitularies in passing without considering their relationship to earlier law or the context of their operation in the ninth century.³ Manacorda⁴ whose analysis of capitulary legislation in Italy in Charlemagne's reign remains without equal (and as Bougard recently noted, without successors⁵) wrote one of the very few works to consider a series of capitularies and to try to place them in both their political and legal

¹MGH Cap. vols. I & II. The MGH edition is deficient in some respects. It passed through the hands of four editors because of illness and death whose approaches were not always consistent.

²C. Radding, *Origins of Medieval Jurisprudence*, (Yale, 1988), pp. 5-36, esp. 17-19 where he argues that early medieval jurists had no concept of legal categorization; more recently, and taking early medieval jurisprudential thought more seriously, H. Lange, 'Die Anfänge der modernen Rechtswissenschaft. Bologna und das frühe Mittelalter', *Akademie der Wissenschaften und der Literatur. (Mainz). Abhandlungen der geistes- und sozialwissenschaftlichen Klasse* 9 (1993), pp. 1-57.

³J. Ficker, *Forschungen zur Reichs- und Rechtsgeschichte Italiens*, (Innsbruck, 1868-74, 4 vols.).

⁴Manacorda, *Ricerche*.

⁵F. Bougard, *La Justice dans le Royaume d'Italie. De la Fin du VIIIe siècle au début du XIe siècle*, (Rome, 1995), p. 25: Manacorda 'n'a guère suscité d'émules'.

context. As I hope to show below, this dual approach is vital. Regrettably Manacorda's early death left this work unfinished and many issues which should have been resolved long ago have never even been broached. Apart from Manacorda's monograph and a small number of very specific studies of individual capitularies⁶ or themes⁷ only general works are available.⁸ These often concentrate on reconstructing judicial procedures rather than considering capitularies as a genre. Ganshof's monograph⁹ remains the basis of much later historiography. However in an Italian context, although now rather old-fashioned, several massive studies of law in medieval Italy by Italian historians of law pre-empted much of what Ganshof said. These works have opinions as similar as their titles, differing only on minor points of detail or emphasis.¹⁰ Moreover Ganshof has virtually nothing to say about capitularies *in Italy*¹¹ - an important distinction. Most recent of all is Bougard's monograph on justice in early medieval Italy;¹² this work does have a chapter on capitularies much of which is concerned with discussing capitulary manuscripts (and has already been superseded by Mordek's comprehensive catalogue) but the great bulk of it is concerned with reconstructing the operation of the judicial system from descriptive sources, that is to say from *placita*, rather than from prescriptive ones such as capitularies. Hence Bougard devotes only a few pages to the actual content of the capitularies.

⁶E.g. L. Dupraz, 'Le Capitulaire de Lothaire I, empereur, *Contra Sarracenos Faciendas*, et la Suisse Romande (847)', *Zeitschrift für Schweizerische Geschichte* 16 (1936), pp. 241-93.

⁷E.g. Tabacco's consideration of military obligations: 'Il Regno Italico nei Secoli IX-XI', *Ordinamenti Militari in Occidente nell'Alto Medioevo* (SSpol 1967, publ. 1968), pp. 763-90.

⁸Cf. the comments of Bougard, *Justice*, p. 25 & n. 28 for further refs.

⁹F. L. Ganshof, *Recherches sur les Capitulaires*, (Paris, 1958).

¹⁰A. Pertile, *Storia del Diritto Italiano dalla Caduta dell'Impero Romano alla codificazione*, (Turin, 1896), vol. I; E. Besta, *Fonti del Diritto Italiano dalla Caduta del Impero Romano sino ai nostri tempi*, (Milan, 1923), vol. I, i; G. Salvio, *Storia del Diritto Italiano*, vol. III, parts 1 & 2, (Milan, 1925), esp. pp. 30-77; G. Astuti, *Lezioni di storia del Diritto Italiano. Le Fonti. Età Romano-Barbarico*, (Padua, 1953); F. Calasso, *Medio Evo del Diritto*, [MED] (Milan, 1954): below for further refs.

¹¹Ganshof, *Recherches*, pp. 16-18 is so brief that it adds little to more general legal histories. He does (p. 16) distinguish 'capitulaires italiens' from 'capitulaires francs' but never defines how and concedes it is 'peu rigoureuse'.

¹²Bougard, *Justice*, pp. 24-52, but note pp. 30-43 are devoted to describing the manuscripts; much of the rest of Bougard's discussion deals with periods beyond the scope of this chapter.

Yet despite many of the problems concerning capitularies being unresolved, (indeed unconsidered) [see below] Italian historians in particular, influenced by Tabacco,¹³ have continued to try to write a sophisticated fusion of socio-economic, institutional and juridical history; in order to do this they have been compelled to try to use capitularies as almost sociological sources.¹⁴ I believe there are difficulties with this approach. Furthermore, with regard to ruler representation this historiography is of little use. Therefore what I offer below will be mostly source criticism with a view to evolving a methodology.

However I begin with some general criteria. Firstly, as indicated above, Italian capitulary manuscripts do not differentiate between what modern scholars regard as different types of capitulary; I have therefore likewise generally sought to avoid doing so.¹⁵ Rather than imposing a modern categorization I hope thus to allow early medieval compilers to define the field. This is particularly significant in terms of understanding the eight/ninth-century perceptions of capitularies as documented by their manuscript tradition. Hence also, for brevity (and to avoid stylistic tedium) I shall sometimes refer to capitularies as 'legislation' or 'law' although I am aware that they cover a wider range of material than the term implies. My justification is again that capitularies appear in the same manuscripts as texts now often described as Germanic law codes; evidently medieval compilers regarded the two types of legislation as in some ways congruent. Furthermore my main interest is in those capitularies known in Italy. This is only a subset of all known Carolingian capitularies. Hence I have sought to follow the selection of texts made by

¹³Tabacco's works are of capital importance. I shall make frequent reference to them below: Tabacco: *I Liberi del Re*; 'Il Regno italico', above n. 5; 'L'Ambiguità delle Istituzioni nell'Europa costruita dei Franchi' *RSI* 87 (1975), pp. 401-38; 'Il Volto Ecclesiastico del Potere nell'età Carolingia', *La Chiesa e il Potere Politico dal Medioevo all'età Contemporanea (Storia d'Italia, Annali 9 - Turin, 1986)*, eds. G. Chittolini & G. Miccoli, pp. 7-41; 'L'Avvento dei Carolingi nel Regno dei Longobardi', *Langobardia*, eds. S. Gasparri & P. Cammarosano (Udine, 1990), pp. 375-403.

¹⁴Noted by Radding, *Origins*, p. 5; an e.g. is A. A. Settia, *Chiese, Strade, e Fortezze nell'Italia Medievale*, (Rome, 1991), pp. 3-17 uses capitulary legislation concerning aristocratic chapels to try and argue for social discrimination concerning churches and suggests rather improbably (p. 14) that the practice was introduced by Frankish immigrants.

¹⁵Cf also below p. 239-42 & nn. 138-9.

early medieval compilers and so allow them to define the field. The only exception to this is that I shall not discuss some texts included in the *MGH Capitularia*, particularly the text of treaties and *divisiones*.¹⁶ Nevertheless it has been necessary to impose some sort of structure on what follows. I have sought, firstly, to consider capitularies' manuscript survival; secondly, to provide a preliminary commentary on capitularies reign by reign; thirdly, to make some synoptic comments about capitularies in general in Carolingian Italy; hence fourthly, to consider the general nature of capitularies, and finally to suggest some of the implications of my conclusions. Of course these divisions are artificial and impose restrictions on the discussion which are sometimes unhelpful.

Manuscripts: Clearly the context of the survival of Carolingian capitularies for Italy can provide evidence about the reception of capitularies. It is an under-researched issue. Italian capitularies survive in some thirty manuscripts¹⁷ ranging from massive compilations (like the late-ninth century manuscript Wolfenbüttel inter Blankenburgenses 130, or Cavensis 22 of c. 1000) to manuscripts dominated by totally different texts which contain just one capitulary on an extra leaf (like the c. 960 addition to Novara, Biblioteca Capitolare cod. XXX).¹⁸ It is apparent that some of these compilations were highly specific (e.g. St. Gall 733 dedicated to capitulary edicts about tithes)¹⁹ while others probably aspired to be more or less complete 'works of reference'. These manuscripts are not as thoroughly understood as the volume of work about them might suggest. One of the most studied manuscripts, for example, Gotha Forschungsbibliothek I. 84, is believed to be a copy of Eberhard of Friuli's personal lawbook. As a codex which belonged to a powerful working aristocrat, related to the Carolingians by marriage, it is of great interest. The text of the laws and some of the capitularies appear to have been compiled by Lupus

¹⁶E.g. the *divisio regni* (Cap. I no. 45, pp. 126-30); *Constitutio Romana* (Cap. I no. 161, pp. 322-5); the treaty between Lothar I and Venice (Cap. I no. 233, pp. 130-5).

¹⁷Bougard, *Justice*, pp. 30-43 lists them and provides brief descriptions. Mordek, *Bibliotheca*, arranged alphabetically, is even more recent and detailed.

¹⁸Mordek, *Bibliotheca*, pp. 395-6, 398.

¹⁹Bougard, *Justice*, p. 35.

entirely, is recorded only in the *Chronicon Sancti Benedicti Cassinensis*.²⁴ Further note that the capitulary in Novara XXX tells us nothing about the military dispositions for the campaign, only about the spiritual preparations to be made beforehand.²⁵ Presumably the military sections of the capitulary had been ignored because they were of no further interest more than a century after the campaign in question whereas the spiritual and ideological preparations could be useful as a model for the church of Novara even in Ottonian times.²⁶ Military capitularies must have had an especially short shelf since after the campaign season was over they were no longer of any use, which is probably why those we know survive in relatively unusual circumstances. However although this difficulty is different in degree from that faced by other capitularies it is probably not different in kind. The concerns of the compiler(s) and copyists clearly matter as much in our understanding of capitularies as the mere question of survival, which the compilers themselves affected. This poses a particularly acute problem for texts which survive in single copies, as do many capitularies. We can never be certain they are complete, much less accurate. As far as military capitularies are concerned let us note that Pippin frequently went on campaign in Italy²⁷ yet we do not possess a single piece of evidence as to how these campaigns were organized.

Furthermore capitularies are often undated in manuscripts so the only way of dating them is by manuscript context, a far from satisfactory method. In this regard the *MGH* editor's datings are often no more than educated guesses (if that). Several capitularies have undergone major redatings which completely change our picture of the development of law in Italy under the Carolingians. For example nos. 92 and 93 issued in Mantua, have

²⁴*CSBC, MGH SS RL*, pp. 469-71; above ch. III, p. 94.

²⁵The *Liber Papiensis* preserves an undated *capitulum* expelling the Jews (*MGH Cap.* II no. 219, c. 2, p. 97) possibly linked to preparations for the southern campaigns. Jews were reported helping Vikings or Arabs: e.g. *AB* a. 847, and esp. a. 852. It is possible that such an expulsion was regarded by Louis as a practical as much as a spiritual safeguard against a Jewish 'Fifth Column'.

²⁶For spiritual preparations generally McCormick, *Eternal Victory*, pp. 342f.

²⁷*ARF* a. 791, 793, 800-2, (Benevento), 796 (Avars), 806 (Corsica, against the Arabs) 810 (Venice); Bertolini, 'Carlomagno', pp. 657f. on Benevento; Pohl, *Die Awaren*, pp. 312f, esp. 317.

of Ferrières in Fulda.²⁰ However it is rather different from the other copy of Eberhard's law-book preserved in Modena O. I. 2, not least because Gotha I. 84 (apparently unlike Modena O. I. 2) is the product of several exemplars *other* than Eberhard's book, including one manuscript written probably in northern Italy between 806-10 and another containing Ottonian legislation. Until it has been clarified which parts of Gotha I. 84 are from Eberhard's manuscript and which from elsewhere and furthermore the exact relationship of the Gotha and Modena manuscripts, it is difficult to use Gotha as evidence for the structure of Eberhard's lawbook.

Unsurprisingly, capitulary manuscripts tend to record capitularies useful to ecclesiastical institutions (cf. the tithe compilation mentioned above). We should bear in mind therefore that even our surviving corpus of material may well record capitularies of interest to compilers rather than the totality of Carolingian legislative activity. Recent work has emphasized the often ad hoc and unofficial nature of some capitulary collections which could be 'written up...by individual participants...: they were personal productions, made without the courtesy of any standardized central office, for local use...'.²¹ The 'private' nature of some capitulary copies is an important point to which I shall return later. It is illustrated by considering two capitularies organizing military campaigns in south Italy in 846/7 and 866.²² Each survives in just one copy: the former is appended, apparently quite haphazardly, to Novara XXX on an extra leaf written in the mid-tenth century,²³ the latter, in an even more extreme fashion having fallen out of the capitulary tradition

²⁰Mordek, *Bibliotheca*, pp. 131-2, 256-7 provides full references to the substantial bibliography on this subject.

²¹Nelson, 'Literacy in Carolingian Government', *The Uses of Literacy in Early Medieval Europe*, ed. McKitterick, pp. 258-96 at 283-5, quotation at 284; the insight comes from Mordek, 'Karolingische Kapitularien', *Überlieferung und Geltung normativer Texte des frühen und hohen Mittelalters*, ed. Mordek, (Sigmaringen, 1986), pp. 25-50 at 32. For once probably rightly Besta, *Storia*, pp. 237, 240 intuited this, commenting that modern versions of capitularies may not have been those of the legislators who issued them and that many of our collections come from 'collettori privati' (sic).

²²*MGH Cap.* II, nos. 203, pp. 64-6, and no. 218, pp. 94-6.

²³E. Cau, 'Scrittura e Cultura a Novara, sec. VIII-X', *Ricerche Medievali* 6-9 (1971-3), pp. 1-74, at 44-9. Mordek, *Bibliotheca*, pp. 395-99, at 396.

been redated from c.787 to 813 since Patetta's discovery of a note in a ninth-century Vercelli manuscript attributing the capitulary to the first year of Bernard's reign.²⁸ This capitulary had been seen as a key moment in the legal history of Italy and of Carolingian attitudes to ethnic law because, if dated to 790, it contains the earliest recorded capitulary edict directing that Lombard law could be replaced by capitulary law - the first occasion this view had been articulated anywhere in the Carolingian empire.²⁹ However if the capitulary is actually from 813 it is a decade later than the 803 revisions of ethnic law which Charlemagne put in place following the imperial coronation and is no more than a reiteration of his earlier position (perhaps related to the Byzantine acknowledgement of the imperial title). Fortunately such queasy chronological problems are relatively rare. Below I shall attempt to outline the development of Carolingian law in Italy and then to consider the character of capitulary legislation, both in general and in specific reigns (since even when the dating is uncertain capitularies can usually be assigned to a particular ruler at least).

There are variations in the Italian manuscript tradition of Carolingian capitularies. The capitularies of Louis the German have all been lost (narrative sources suggest that he *did* legislate).³⁰ Our knowledge of late Carolingian capitularies in Italy i.e. essentially those of Louis II, is good by comparison. The *MGH* edition publishes fourteen capitularies, of Louis II and although three of these are cobbled together from fragmentary compilations, at least eleven survive as units in manuscripts.³¹ However the manuscript tradition for Louis II's capitularies is much slimmer than for those of earlier Carolingians. Twelve manuscripts include capitularies of Louis II but six include only one of his edicts; the

²⁸F. Patteta, 'Sull'introduzione in Italia della Collezione di Ansegi e sulla Data del Cosidetto «Capitulare Mantuanum Duplex» attribuito al 787', *Atti della Reale Accademia delle Scienze di Torino*, 25 (1890-1), pp. 876-85. The manuscript in question is Vercelli, Biblioteca Capitolare Eusebiana CLXXIV; the note is on fol. 77r - see Mordek, *Bibliotheca*, p. 891 & below n. 39; the best discussion is Manacorda, *Ricerche*, pp. 31 n.1, 62f, esp. 65.

²⁹Ullmann, *Carolingian Kingship*, p. 91.

³⁰T. Reuter, *Germany in the Early Middle Ages*, pp. 89-90.

³¹*MGH Cap. II*, nos. 208-13, 214-18 complete; nos. 219 fragmentary; Bougard, *Justice*, p. 39; for manuscripts of Louis II's capitularies see Mordek, *Bibliotheca*, p. 1104.

largest collection of Louis II's capitularies is the six in Wolfenbüttel inter Blankenburgensis 130. Four of his capitularies survive in single copies,³² a further two survive in two closely-related manuscripts representing a single exemplar,³³ while another capitulary fell out of the capitulary manuscript tradition entirely and is preserved only in a chronicle.³⁴ In other words fully half of Louis' surviving legislation is known to us from just a single manuscript or pairs of manuscripts which go back to a single exemplar. Given that I am including in this assessment manuscripts written in the tenth century and trying to allow for the fact that the count for earlier Carolingians is increased by manuscripts written before 844 (which therefore could not have included his legislation), this is nevertheless striking. It is in marked contrast to the pattern of capitulary survival for other Carolingians. Louis's capitularies might not have been recorded in tenth-century manuscripts because they were unavailable (although that in itself would be of interest) but even ninth-century manuscripts show relatively few of Louis II's capitularies in comparison to the number of capitularies they record from Charlemagne, Louis the Pious and Lothar I. This dip from the mid-ninth century onwards has been noticed before³⁵ but the various interpretations offered (e.g. Lothar I's reorganisation of the chancellery)³⁶ seem rather unconvincing. Ganshof³⁷ too saw a shift in the last years of Louis the Pious's reign, arguing that the character of capitularies changed as a result of Louis the Pious's troubles and became much more authentically consensual after 840. However this is open to question. The effects of the events of 833-4 on legislation are in fact quite uncertain not least in Italy, with which Ganshof was little concerned.

³²*MGH Cap.* II nos. 208, 211, 212, 213; Bougard, *Justice*, p. 39.

³³*MGH Cap.* II nos. 216, 217 only recorded in Gotha I.84 and Modena O.I.2; Bougard, *Justice*, pp. 30-1, 39; Mordek, *Bibliotheca*, pp. 1104, 148, 266; cf. ch. II, pp. 30-1 for manuscript relationship.

³⁴*MGH Cap.* II no. 218, pp. 94-6 (a. 866), from *CSBC* c. 3, *MGH SS RL* pp. 469-71.

³⁵Bougard, *Justice*, p. 52, notes that the capitulary manuscript tradition 'se rarefie' from the reign of Louis II. Cf. how much less dense the tables are in *ibid.* p. 39.

³⁶Besta, *Fonti*, pp. 237-8.

³⁷Ganshof, *Recherches*, pp. 34-7, esp. 36.

One possibility is that the early introduction into Italy of Ansegis's collection vitiated the demand for complete up-to-date sets of the ruler's capitularies. The 829 date of Ansegis's compilation³⁸ coincides quite well with the end of the last series of capitularies to be widely-known, Lothar's capitularies of the 820s; however Ansegis's work cannot be certainly placed in Italy until 880x900,³⁹ and only one surviving ninth-century Italian manuscript contains a complete copy of Ansegis;⁴⁰ moreover even Ansegis's collection was incomplete, using only twenty-six out of some ninety capitularies issued up to that time.⁴¹ This would still not entirely explain the relative paucity of manuscripts containing Louis II's capitularies.

From an ideological point of view it is interesting to note that Carolingian capitularies are known in south Italian manuscripts produced in regions never under Carolingian control. Admittedly these manuscripts are from the late tenth century but two (Cavensis 22 and Chisiano) are closely-related and almost certainly derive from a common exemplar⁴² (perhaps north Italian?). Both manuscripts contain very large collections and it is striking that Carolingian capitularies appear to have had a wider circulation in southern Italy than the laws produced by the Beneventan princes.⁴³ Only one capitulary of Louis II is known from these two southern manuscripts and that it is from early in his reign.⁴⁴ This absence may reflect the political sensitivity of Louis's role as the only Carolingian who had really exercised much authority in the south. However, many northern capitularies for earlier Carolingians are present in these manuscripts and since, as indicated above, Louis's

³⁸Ganshof, *Recherches*, pp. 69-70.

³⁹Patteta, 'L'introduzione', *passim*; Bougard, *Justice*, pp. 41-2.

⁴⁰Vercelli Biblioteca Capitolare Eusebiana CLXXIV fols. 1-76v, is almost complete (only Bk 4, cc. 71-4 are missing); the fragment Turin, Biblioteca Nazionale Universitaria, J. IV. 24, burnt in 1904, also had a nearly complete copy; Mordek, *Bibliotheca*, pp. 743, 891, 1100. On the Vercelli manuscript cf. Bougard, *Justice*, p. 32. A new edition of Ansegis is available: ed. G. Schmitz, *Die Kapitulariensammlung des Ansegis. Capitularia Regum Francorum Nova series I*, (Hannover, 1996). His intro. discusses the manuscript tradition at length.

⁴¹Ganshof, *Recherches*, p. 70.

⁴²Mordek, *Bibliotheca*, pp. 98-111, 756-67.

⁴³Edited in *MGH Leges IV* ed. F. Bluhme, pp. 225-34; newer ed. Azzara, *Leggi*, pp. 266-79; most recently discussed by Martin, *La Pouille*, pp. 235-7.

⁴⁴*MGH Cap.* II no. 208, pp. 78 (a. 844-50) in Chigi F. IV. 75, fol. 109v; Mordek, *Bibliotheca*, p. 767.

capitularies appear to have been generally less widely-copied, this may merely reflect limited sources. Furthermore by the time these capitularies were copied Carolingian legislation may well have ceased to have the political overtones that it undoubtedly possessed in the times of Arichis II and Adelchis II. The use of capitularies as legal guidelines may have meant that they circulated in the way that Roman law or canon law would have done rather than as any indication of northern supremacy. That the manuscripts contain miniatures of lawgivers from Theoderic to Adelchis⁴⁵ strongly suggests that the capitularies here derived their authority not from their Carolingian origins but from antiquity and venerable tradition.

Capitularies in Context: In this section I will examine the Italian capitularies in their chronological context and offer preliminary commentaries on their content. In a later section I shall deal with them synoptically, comparing and contrasting the capitularies of the whole Carolingian period in Italy.

It is fortunately unnecessary to offer a detailed analysis of the capitularies from 774-814; the secondary literature on them is vast. The Italian capitularies, have seldom been subjected to close analysis as a group. The two scholars whose works are exceptions to this rule are Manacorda, whose volume is still the standard account of the capitularies of Charlemagne and Pippin in Italy,⁴⁶ and Tabacco, who has made extensive use of Manacorda's study to produce a subtle overview of the period. Manacorda saw these capitularies as part of the 'settlement' of Italy, in both senses of the term. The earliest capitularies (esp. no. 88) were designed to deal with the problems created by the Frankish conquest and its results, firstly at a practical level by ending disorder, famine and profiteering and secondly, in institutional terms, by incorporating the Lombard kingdom

⁴⁵Illustrated in e.g. *SNapoli*, II, 2 pl., pp. 144-5; *I Longobardi*, pp. 339, 343; political interpretation of the miniatures: P. Delogu, 'La Giustizia nell'Italia Meridionale', *La Giustizia nell'Alto Medioevo secc. VIII-XI*, (SSpol 1996), t.II, pp. 257-308, at 297-300; cf the general comments in M. Rotili, *La Miniatura nella Badia di Cava*, (Cava dei Tirreni, 1978), t. II, pp. 64-8.

⁴⁶Manacorda supersedes (but makes use of) the important earlier study by C. De Clercq, 'Capitulaires Francs en Italie à l'Époque de Charlemagne', *Hommage à Dom Ursmer Berlière*, (Recueil publié par l'Institut Historique Belge de Rome..., Brussels, 1931), pp. 251-60.

into the Carolingian empire.⁴⁷ This latter process was the dominant theme from the 780s onwards. The episcopate was integrated into government and wide-ranging Carolingian capitularies with a distinctly ecclesiastical flavour were produced regularly.⁴⁸ Counts and bishops were ordered to co-operate, episcopal authority was particularly reinforced and extended into many areas where apparently it had not operated hitherto and capitularies also incorporated rules governing the organisation of ecclesiastical institutions.⁴⁹ The Italian capitularies were often especially closely related to the 779 capitulary of Herstal⁵⁰ and their injunctions often seem to have been intended to extend its demands to Italy.⁵¹ The relationship between Charlemagne's 'Frankish' capitularies and the Italian ones is interesting and will be discussed further below. Manacorda and Tabacco have thoroughly contextualized the latter, however there does not seem to be any programmatic theme to them, at least not across the whole reign.

Louis the Pious never issued any capitularies explicitly for Italy although his general capitularies were certainly circulated in the peninsula and copies survive in Italian manuscripts.⁵² His eldest son however did issue Italian capitularies, reviving the Italian tradition after a gap of at least twelve years. Lothar I's capitularies can be divided into those from the 820s and those after 828; the earlier set themselves fall into two obvious groups which were issued in two great bursts, during his brief trips to the peninsula in 822-3 and 825.⁵³ Nos. 157, 158 and 159 were promulgated in 823; nos. 162-5 in 825.⁵⁴ Although the two sets of capitularies are distinct they did have common themes. The 823 capitularies cover a wide range of questions, especially concerning property, inheritance,

⁴⁷*MGH Cap I* no. 88, pp. 187-8; Manacorda, *Ricerche*, pp. 36-43.

⁴⁸Manacorda, *Ricerche*, *passim*; Tabacco, 'L'Avvento', *passim* but esp. 385-94.

⁴⁹On counts and bishops: Manacorda, *Ricerche*, p. 59; on the reinforcement of episcopal authority *idem. passim* but e.g. p. 42 on *MGH Cap. I* no. 88, c. 4, p. 188. See also refs. to Tabacco's works below.

⁵⁰*MGH Cap I* no. 20, pp. 47f.

⁵¹Manacorda, *Ricerche*, pp. 46, 48, 49, referring to *MGH Cap.* no. 89, c. 1, p. 189 (a.786/7); no. 90, pp. 190-1; cf. Tabacco, 'Il Volto', p. 15f; *ibid.* 'L'Avvento', pp. 386, 387.

⁵²Mordek, *Bibliotheca*, pp. 1094-5; above pp. 214f.

⁵³Jarnut, 'Lothar', pp. 352-3.

⁵⁴*MGH Cap. I* no. 157, 158, 159, pp. 316-21; nos. 163-5, pp. 326-31.

oaths and the *res publica*. In 157, for example, cc.1 and 2 concern a freemen's rights to build or own church; the next three *capitula* deal with female status and developments which might alter it, such as adultery (c. 3), debt (c. 4) or taking the veil (c. 5), while c. 6 concerns the comital administration of oaths. Similarly no. 158 dealt with inheritance or other ways of transferring property, legitimate and otherwise (cc. 1, 2, 8, 10); the rights of counts (cc. 3, 4, 5, 13) and the organisation of public matters, whether the paying or performing of *scubia publica* (c. 11), the writing of *carte publice* (cc. 12, 15) or military service (c. 18); and added a couple of statements concerning the reversion of widows to the law under which they lived before marriage (c. 16) and prohibition on merchants (c. 17). No. 159 is likewise an eclectic combination dealing with a woman's status if she has sexual relations with a slave (c. 1), that royal officials are not to participate in the fraudulent sale of cattle (c. 2), the status of those who commended themselves to the monarch and the *homines liberi* of such men (c.3); and finally in c. 4 that property acquired on their own account by gastalds who managed royal estates would be granted back if they had been found to be faithful in the king's service. These are broad edicts but they seem neither comprehensive nor especially programmatic, which is to say they neither aimed to regulate a particular field in its entirety nor were conceived of as statements of principle. They look like a series of ad hoc pieces of legislation reacting to current requirements.

This is something of a contrast with the 825 capitularies. Nos. 163, 164 and 165 do appear to be organised around subjects or categories, although these are not immediately apparent. On the face of it no. 163⁵⁵ is just as eclectic as the 823 capitularies: c. 1 asserts the bishop's right, indeed duty, to excommunicate those who are *totiens correpta* [sic], while c. 2 restates that earlier royal immunities are to be respected, that the usufruct of properties given to the Church can only be retained if the ecclesiastical institution involved agrees (c. 3),. that bishops, abbots and abbesses are to have two *advocati* (c.

⁵⁵MGH Cap. I no. 163, pp. 326-7.

4),⁵⁶ that usury is forbidden *post contestationem episcopi* (c. 5), that, in a famous order, central schools are to be established for the teaching of doctrine (c. 6),⁵⁷ that the bishop is to prepare monks in his diocese properly by a specific date (c. 7), that *plebes* (baptismal churches) are to be restored and tithes paid (cc. 8, 9) and finally that, concerning church property, the actions of earlier ecclesiastical *rectores* were not binding upon their successors and hence if such property had been granted away *inrationabiliter* it should revert to the *ius ecclesiae*.

Fischer has already suggested that this capitulary extends into Italy the 816-19 ecclesiastical reforms promulgated by Louis the Pious.⁵⁸ This is probably true. However I believe we can also approach this text from a slightly different angle. All its articles deal with relations between the secular and ecclesiastical world, mostly in terms of the bishop's rights and obligations. This capitulary distinguishes between 'secular' and 'ecclesiastical' tasks but regards them as contiguous. In c. 1 the bishop is said to be empowered to order a person to appear *pro quibuslibet culpis atque criminibus*; the *bannum* came into effect when the bishop's order to appear is ignored; the bishop decides when to enact excommunication, whereas the count's job is to enforce that - to capture those excommunicated and bring them in chains before the king. Similarly in c. 5 usurers were to desist after the bishop had warned them, and if they did not the count was to seize or imprison them. Even c. 6 concerning schools fits this explanation; it is stated to be *de doctrina* and the schools are intended to extinguish *incuria atque ignavia*. The purpose of 163 is therefore to specify the interface between the ecclesiastical and secular worlds in the legal and spiritual fields. It offers an account of, on the one hand, the bishop's duty to deal forcefully with wrongdoing (cc. 1, 5) and to organise and supervise spiritual affairs (cc. 6, 7), on the other hand, regulations concerning ecclesiastical property and the arrangements for dealing with disputes about it (cc. 2, 3, 4, 10) and the

⁵⁶Earlier injunction to the same effect is *MGH Cap.* I no. 91, c. 6, p. 192; Manacorda, *Ricerche*, p. 54.

⁵⁷See ch. IV, p. 135.

⁵⁸Fischer, *Königtum*, p. 82; cf. *MGH Cap.* I no. 138, pp. 275-80; and no. 141, pp. 288f.

PAGE NUMBERING AS IN THE ORIGINAL THESIS

capitula would then concern the proper organisation of public justice. Broadly these injunctions all pertain to 'political' matters. Public justice was the mechanism for resolving problems about property and such problems were in turn of great concern to the state because land-holding related to military service. Military service was increasingly unpopular and the capitularies reveal disquiet about this. Tabacco comments about this are typically incisive⁶⁴ but he does not consider the capitulary as a whole, only its military aspects. These are I believe informed by the capitulary's general concerns. Oath-giving was central to the legal process. By protecting it these capitularies aimed at preserving faith in the judicial system. Moreover it gave the state an opportunity to interfere in property settlements which were not to its advantage. Cc. 1, 2, 3 and 5 specify stiff penalties for either failing to appear for the muster or attempting to avoid it by giving away land *fraudulenter*. No. 165 therefore concerns the two key elements of the secular world, land-holding and military service.

Two capitularies are possibly related to this group, nos. 160 and 166. In marked contrast to nos. 162-5, these two capitularies have very slender manuscript traditions. 160 is recorded only in Wolfenbüttel; no. 166 survives in only one other copy, Gotha I. 84. No. 166⁶⁵ is the simplest one to deal with. It is usually dated to 825 by analogy with other capitularies. In fact these analogies could go a lot further. It bears a very close resemblance to the wording of passages of no. 164. C. 2 repeats almost verbatim cc. 5, 6 from no. 164 'women living with priests' and the duty of a bishop to correct abuses. Similarly c. 3 repeats c. 4 of no. 164 about *xenodochia* sticking to the wishes of their founder, and c. 4 reprises c. 2 and 3 of no. 164 about baptismal churches. There are small differences between the two capitularies but the similarities are so close that one is inclined to think 166 only a partial variant copy of 164. Only the exceptionally complete late ninth-century Wolfenbüttel manuscript preserves 166 and 164 together.⁶⁶ This could be no more

⁶⁴Tabacco, 'Il regno italico', *cit.*

⁶⁵MGH Cap I no. 166, p. 332.

⁶⁶Mordek, *Bibliotheca*, pp. 1097, 933-4.

than a copyist's error. The textual similarities and the manuscript tradition, however, are such that I believe one is justified in thinking 166 to be a partial copy of 164.

To conclude this discussion of Lothar I's capitularies from the 820s let us consider no. 160.⁶⁷ This capitulary deals with monastic matters. The *MGH* edition dates it '823?' presumably on codicological grounds. No. 160 survives only in the Wolfenbüttel manuscript, where it is recorded on fols. 106v, after a copy of no. 157, which we know to be of 823, and before no. 165, which we know to be of 825.⁶⁸ No. 166 is undated but this codicological argument need not be decisive. No. 160 might be thought to be either at the end of the 823 group or at the start of the 825 group. Moreover the scribe's criteria for including it at this particular point are not certain. Since the text is undated as far as we can tell from this copy the scribe had no more information about the date of promulgation than do we. Given that no. 160 can be thought of as a capitulary concerned with monastic organisation it perhaps fits better into the 825 group, as the monastic counterpart to 163 which dealt with the church's relationship with the secular world, 164 dealing with the lesser clergy and 165 concerned with the secular world's landholding.

Lothar's series of capitularies 163-5 thus represent an impressive statement of the ideal organisation of the *regnum Italiae* and an advance over those of 823 at the very least in the sense that they are systematic in a way that the 823 capitularies were not. Note that in 824 Lothar I had been crowned by the pope and in 825 he had adopted a new imperial title which was exactly the same as his father's. From this point onwards there was, at least formally, no distinction between the honorifics of the two emperors. The 825 capitularies may therefore have been intended as a grand statement of principle.

Again the reiterative character of capitularies. Lothar I's 832 capitulary⁶⁹ is relevant here: it was a reprise of Carolingian capitulary legislation, indeed it specifically says *haec sunt capitula, quae domnus Hlotharius rex [sic]...excerpsit de capitulis domni Karoli avi*

⁶⁷*MGH Cap I* no. 160, p. 321.

⁶⁸Mordek, *Bibliotheca*, p. 933.

⁶⁹*MGH Cap. II* no. 201, pp. 59-63.

sui ac serenissimi imperatoris Hludowici genitoris sui. This capitulary is heavily-based on earlier ones. The injunction in c.1 that churches were to be 'conserved' refers back explicitly to *sicut in capitulare nostro continetur, quod ad Olonnam fecimus* - perhaps Lothar's 825 capitulary.⁷⁰ But the injunction itself goes back even earlier in Carolingian legislation to a series of capitularies of Pippin.⁷¹ Further on in c.1 of the 832 capitulary Lothar orders the destruction of superfluous churches, another *capitulum* drawn from one of Charlemagne's capitularies of 803⁷² and alongside this, following, as the capitulary acknowledges, the *iussio* of his father,⁷³ Lothar orders that where construction of a church is necessary it is to be provided with a *mansus* of land. C. 7 concerning the reduction of the *pauperes liberi homines* forced to sell their properties is taken verbatim from another capitulary of Charlemagne.⁷⁴ Indeed these examples can be expanded to include almost literally every article of the capitulary. The same is true of Lothar's other 832 capitulary.⁷⁵

Bougard has both noted the nature of the 832 capitulary as a summation of earlier capitularies⁷⁶ and suggested that its ideological purpose was to reaffirm Lothar's attachment to 'imperial unity and by this to that of the Lombard kingdom', presumably in reaction to his deposition of Louis the Pious.⁷⁷ However it seems nonsensical for Lothar to affirm unity by producing legislation of strictly limited application. (Imperial unity is an idea which has enjoyed a perhaps disproportionate significance in the historiography of Louis the Pious's reign.⁷⁸) Although the specifics of Bougard's interpretation require reconsideration, he is probably correct to argue for an ideological understanding of the capitulary. Rather than affirming imperial unity, however, Lothar's 832 capitulary may

⁷⁰As the editor suggests: *MGH Cap.* I no. 163, p. 327, c. 8 & n. 4.

⁷¹*MGH Cap.* I no. 91, p. 191, c. 1; no. 93, p. 196, c. 3; no. 95, p. 200, c. 2.

⁷²*MGH Cap.* I no. 40, p. 115, c. 1.

⁷³*MGH Cap.* I no. 138, p. 277, c. 10 (a. 818/19).

⁷⁴*MGH Cap.* I no. 44, c. 16, p. 125; noted by Tabacco, *Liberi*, pp. 45-6.

⁷⁵*MGH Cap.* I no. 202, pp. 63-4 (a.832), see esp. the editor's notes.

⁷⁶Bougard, *Justice*, p. 50 & n. 109.

⁷⁷Bougard, *Justice*, pp. 28-9.

⁷⁸Most recently, E. Boshoff, 'Einheitsidee und Teilungsprinzip in der Regierungszeit Ludwig des Frommen', *Charlemagne's Heir*, eds. Godman & Collins, pp. 161-90.

have been designed to affirm his own political survival after the revolt of 830;⁷⁹ emperors legislated and the capitulary was a demonstration that he had not abandoned his plans nor the perquisites of imperial office. Similar interpretations can be made of the other capitularies. The 802 capitulary can be linked to the 'imperial' legislation which followed Charlemagne's coronation in 800 and which incorporated additions or reiterations of the laws of the *gentes*⁸⁰ and the 812/13 capitularies are probably related to a similar imperial reflex following Byzantine recognition of the imperial title and paralleled by currency reforms which introduced the well-known *xpictiana religio* coins.⁸¹

There are other examples of the repetitive nature of Carolingian capitularies; for example, let us consider the capitularies of Louis II. Delogu, followed by others, has argued from Louis II's early capitularies that there was a crisis in the *regnum Italiae* in the first years of Louis's reign.⁸² In fact the capitularies are his only evidence of this crisis. Delogu followed an older historiographical tradition which regarded Louis the Pious's reign as a period of decline but this school of thought has now largely been superseded.⁸³ Moreover Delogu sought to emphasize Louis II's achievements; he therefore downplayed the effect of Lothar's presence in Italy in the 830s and presented the substantial continuity of aristocratic personnel across 844 as a sign of Louis II's ability to rally the elite⁸⁴ to the cause of regenerating the kingdom's government. I do not see how the aristocrats who had been unable to solve the problems listed in the capitularies (indeed were arguably their cause according to Delogu) could suddenly become competent to solve them in the years following 844.

⁷⁹See Nelson, *Charles the Bald*, pp. 88-9 for a short account.

⁸⁰Calasso, *MED*, p. 115 discusses the capitulary in exactly this context but never specifically relates the content of these two pieces of legislation.

⁸¹Coins: see ch. V, pp. 170-1.

⁸²Delogu, 'Lodovico II', pp. 137-50, esp. 137-41. Cf Wickham, *Early Medieval Italy*, pp. 60-1.

⁸³Delogu, 'Lodovico II', pp. 137-8 refers to 'una progressiva carenza dell'autorità regia'; cf. *contra* eds. Godman & Collins, *Charlemagne's Heir*, *passim*.

⁸⁴On problems with the secular aristocracy: Delogu, 'Lodovico II', pp. 137-8, 142-5, 147-8; on their resolution, 149-53.

Delogu argues that capitularies nos. 209 and 210 enable us to reconstruct the state of the kingdom and identifies several key points: the maladministration of justice by counts, their association with and protection of bandits, the oppression of the *pauperes*, and the poor maintenance of public structures such as palaces, roads, *xenodochia* and bridges.⁸⁵ In fact few of the elements in these capitularies were original. Complaints about public structures and the protection of the poor had been current in capitularies since the early years of Charlemagne's reign.⁸⁶ The oppression of the poor is a staple of capitulary demands⁸⁷ and can hardly be taken at face value. It is hard to see why we should take such statements as evidence that conditions were any worse in the 830s and 840s than in, say, the 780s.

This applies not only synoptically across these capitularies as a group but at a much more detailed level within each one. The evidence of no. 210, for example, cannot be taken simply as a description of grassroots conditions. It consists of the proceedings of a synod subsequently enacted as a capitulary. It does not even state whether Louis II was present. The bishops are at pains to emphasize that much of what they say has been said before: they specify that six of the seventeen *capitulae* had been promulgated by earlier Carolingians;⁸⁸ a further four are in fact re-enactments of earlier capitulary injunctions⁸⁹ whose reiteration the synod merely chose not to stress. No. 210 is more like a summation of Louis the Pious's and Lothar I's regulations than an attempt to establish new norms.

Hence I would argue that these capitularies are best understood in an ideological context. The capitularies Delogu particularly cites in his notes (nos. 209, 210, 213) have other common elements apart from their date: their verbose and wide-ranging nature; the

⁸⁵Delogu, 'Lodovico II', pp. 139-40, 149.

⁸⁶E.g. *MGH Cap.* I no. 91, p. 192, c. 4 (a. 782); no. 92, p. 195, c. 3 (prob. 813: see Manacorda, *Ricerche*, pp. 62f.); no. 141, p. 290, cc. 3, 17 (a. 819); cf. Arcari, *Idee*, p. 908. Wickham, *Early Medieval Italy*, p. 61 tries to get round this by suggesting that the capitularies provide 'an unusually detailed list of illegalities'. See below.

⁸⁷Noted by Fischer, *Königtum*, p. 14.

⁸⁸*MGH Cap.* II no. 210, pp. 82-3, cc. 6, 7, 8, 11, 15, 16.

⁸⁹*MGH Cap.* II no. 210, pp. 82-3, cc. 12, 13, noted by the editors; to which I would add c. 10 (which is close to *Cap* I no. 163, c. 10) and c. 9 (*Cap* I no. 164, p. 328, c. 6).

high profile of three prelates, Angilbert II of Milan, Andreas of Aquileia and the arch-chaplain Joseph of Ivrea; and the description of three of these capitularies as the proceedings of synods.

The timing of the promulgation of these edicts is also clearly significant. They were all issued at moments of transition in Louis II's reign: no. 210 from the beginning of Louis's government (844-50), no. 213 of 850 marked his acquisition of the imperial title alongside Lothar I, and no. 214 of 855 his sole rule following Lothar's abdication. For two of the capitularies we can be certain that they were issued as a result of Pavian councils, the sort of grand public events ideal for propaganda offensives. All this suggests the importance of the ideological aspect of these capitularies. Bougard has noted in passing that

chaque début de règne, chaque accession à une dignité nouvelle voit la publication d'une texte [de capitulaire]. Tous n'ont pas...la valeur de capitulaires-programmes, fixant de grandes orientations pour tout le royaume. Il s'agit plutôt de prendre date, de sanctionner le changement politique par une mesure dont le fond importe finalement peu et qui, souvent, rappelle la tradition...⁹⁰

Such a characterization seems to describe these capitularies well. I would therefore suggest that Louis II's early legislation represented a promise of continued good government along the lines of earlier Carolingian administrations (which is why it repeats so many injunctions from earlier capitularies) rather than evidence for the situation on the ground. Indeed Delogu himself admits that even as late as Louis II's 865 capitulary⁹¹ some of these issues were still being reprised and that they were an attempt to recreate the 'tradizione del regno italico come organismo autonomo all'interno del complesso carolingio',⁹² although one might feel this characterization of the *regnum Italiae* is more contentious than Delogu allows. The 'crisis' of the early years of Louis's reign disappears when Louis's early capitularies are re-evaluated. This also means that the

⁹⁰Bougard, *Justice*, p. 52.

⁹¹*MGH Cap.* II nos. 216, pp. 91-3; 217, pp. 93-4.

⁹²Delogu, 'Lodovico II', p. 149.

pattern Delogu gave to Louis's reign (initial crisis, gradual improvement followed by final disaster in 871) likewise needs reconsideration. Thus an acknowledgement of the change in the nature of legislation after 774 can have profound effects on our understanding of events.

Italian Capitularies - Synoptic Comments: The example of Louis II emphasizes the importance of placing capitularies in their legislative/historical context quite as much as their political/historical one. Such contextualization however proves that there can be no easy generalizations. Lothar I's capitularies from the 820s are quite unlike those of Louis II above, are indeed different in character from his 832 capitulary too. Lothar's government issued an intense burst of ten capitularies in six years between 822-8.⁹³ It is reasonable to see many of the articles of these capitularies as an effort to introduce into Italy the reforms promulgated in the preceding decade by Louis the Pious⁹⁴ under the influence of reformers like Benedict of Aniane. About a third of Lothar's *capitula* deal with sexual relations and chastity, particularly of nuns and clerics. In the same period this legislation went in parallel with the imperial policy concerning charters for monastic institutions, which were only issued or confirmed by the emperor(s) if the administrative safeguards prescribed in the capitularies were put in place. Generally this meant appointing an outside *rector* (often the local bishop) to oversee the monastery and maintain good order. That this was not just Louis the Pious's idea is shown by Lothar's application of it in his own 837 grant to S. Salvatore in Brescia which was inspected by two abbots and two bishops before its property was confirmed.⁹⁵ Lothar's capitularies of the 820s therefore appear to be part of a consistent, integrated government reform

⁹³MGH *Cap.* II nos. 157-9, 162-6, pp. 316-32. Jarnut, 'Ludwig der Fromme, Lothar I und das *Regnum Italiae*', in eds Godman & Collins, *Charlemagne's Heir*, pp. 349-62 provides a preliminary account of Italy in the 820s but scarcely touches upon capitularies; his statement (p. 353) that Lothar's capitularies ended the tradition of specifically Italian legislation is correct only because the Carolingian empire itself had ceased to exist by the time the next capitularies were issued in the 840s.

⁹⁴Thus Fischer, *Königtum*, p. 82, who regards *Cap.* I no. 138, pp. 275-80, and no. 141, pp. 288f, as 819 extensions to Italy of Louis's monastic reform of 816, later (a. 823) reprised in Lothar no. 163, pp. 326-7.

⁹⁵*DLo* no. 35, pp. 112-15, (15 Dec. 837, Marengo).

programme. There is even a hint that this was so in the prologue to one of the capitularies where Lothar comments on the promulgation of so much *in tam parvo spatio temporis*.⁹⁶

The 830s are far more confused. The general pause in legislative activity from 835⁹⁷ to, at the earliest, 844 is the longest break in Italy between pieces of legislation since the start of the Carolingian period. More importantly still the character of Lothar's 832 capitulary is different from those of the 820s. It is reiterative rather than innovatory and (perhaps like those of Louis II) ideological since it was probably issued in response to Lothar's effort to oust Louis the Pious. It may well mark a decisive further shift in the nature of capitularies in Italy.

Likewise Louis II's capitularies can be considered generally more reiterative than those of earlier Carolingians. Thus concerning infrastructural orders Louis repeated the injunction to restore palaces, bridges and *xenodochia* or *publicae domus* four times for each subject in different capitularies.⁹⁸ So conventional did this become that he took to listing these 'public works' together - palaces and bridges, followed by *xenodochia*. In one capitulary the maintenance of these public structures was explicitly associated with the proper ordering of, respectively, in the first article the *res publica* and in the second the monastic life.⁹⁹ Similarly Louis made repeated orders that widows, orphans and the poor were to be protected and that the *potentes* were not to commit abuses at their expense or oppress them.¹⁰⁰ Remarkably little of this capitulary legislation was in any sense innovative. At least one of his capitularies survives as only a list of headings.¹⁰¹ Capitulary manuscript compilers may have seen little new in his works and hence been disinclined to copy them. Again the subject-matter is entirely conventional in nature and there is every

⁹⁶MGH Cap. II no. 159, p. 320, ll. 20-1, 25.

⁹⁷Cf. Nelson, 'Last Years', pp. 147-8 on the absence of capitularies in the late 830s.

⁹⁸Bridges: MGH Cap. II nos. 211, p. 84, c.3; 212, p. 85, c.5; 213, pp. 87-8, c. 8; 217, p. 94, c. 4. Palaces: nos. 212, p. 85, c.8; 213, p. 87, c.6; 216, p. 92, c. 3; 217, p. 94, c. 4. *Xenodochiae*: 210, p. 82, c. 7; 212, p. 85, c.8; 213, p. 87, c. 7; 217, p. 94, c. 5.

⁹⁹E.g. MGH Cap. II, no. 217, pp. 93-4, c. 4.

¹⁰⁰MGH Cap. II, no. 212, pp. 84-5, cc. 2, 3, 10; no. 216, cc. 1, 3, 6, 7; no. 217, p. 93, c. 2.

¹⁰¹MGH Cap. II, no. 209, pp. 79-80.

reason to think that it too was a restatement of best practice. However there were innovations such as Louis's reduction of the period after their husband's death that widows wishing to join a nunnery had to wait before entering orders. This was because of the threat of kidnap.¹⁰² Thus even though generally Louis repeated the norms of his predecessors this may not explain the relative paucity of manuscripts containing his capitularies. Their absence from tenth century manuscripts is still striking but it is difficult to move from the generally-held impression of a decline in the importance of capitularies to specific explanations of this development.

Even if copyists were unwilling to reproduce Louis's capitularies, this reiterative legislative approach did offer the emperor an ideological advantage. He was able to place himself in the Carolingian tradition of good government. This may have given his capitularies a short shelf-life but it also served a more immediate image-building purpose - Louis as the guarantor of good rule, like his forebears.

Characterizing Capitularies: Having considered the texts themselves and the manuscripts which contained them let us now turn to capitularies generically and adopt a different perspective on their production and its context.

There is general agreement on a number of points such as the essential administrative continuities before and after the Frankish conquest, the incorporation of the episcopate into the legislative body and the continuing general efficacy of law¹⁰³ (whatever one chooses to mean by efficacy in relation to early medieval law).¹⁰⁴ This continuity is usually held to find expression in two main ways: firstly, by the promulgation of capitularies only for Italy by Carolingian rulers, such as Pippin and Lothar I, whose legislative activity was generally limited to the peninsula;¹⁰⁵ secondly, according to the nineteenth century editors, by the issuing of capitularies in a *forma langobardica*.¹⁰⁶

¹⁰²MGH Cap. II, no. 215, p. 90, c. 2.

¹⁰³E.g. Tabacco, *Struggle*, pp. 116-7; Wickham, *Early Medieval Italy*, pp. 48-9.

¹⁰⁴Bougard, *Justice*, p. 54 broaches the question.

¹⁰⁵Before 840 Lothar only legislated alone outside Italy from 830-33. Otherwise before 840 his non-Italian legislation was always issued jointly with Louis the Pious: see below pp. 242f. Of course alongside

The latter point can probably be dismissed. I do not believe we should read any ethnic significance into 'Lombard' capitulary forms which might be characterized equally accurately as 'Italian' or 'peninsular'. The advantage of such terms is that they emphasize the geographical rather than ethnic origin of the practices concerned. Moreover Ganshof¹⁰⁷ may well have overstressed the importance of the Lombard form since in fact only two such instances are known. The first is a version of the 779 capitulary of Herstal.¹⁰⁸ The *forma langobardica* sometimes has a more precise wording (certainly longer) but the substance of the legislation is not different. C. 7, for example, concerning tithes directs *ut unusquisque suam decimam donet, atque per iussionem pontificis dispensentur*; the Lombard form of this article is the same except for referring to the *iussio et consilium episcopi* (rather than *pontificis*) and adding the rather unnecessary extra detail that the bishop to whom the tithe should be paid was that one *in cuius parrochia fuerit* the tithe-payer. Likewise in c. 1 the reference to metropolitans and their *suffraganii episcopi* is amended in the Lombard form to metropolitans and *eorum suffraganii episcopi*, a gratuitously accurate identification. In some cases the Lombard form is slightly more precise but essentially these additional phrases serve as a kind of incorporated gloss bringing out the meaning of the *capitula* more clearly. Indeed it has been suggested that these 'Lombard' forms are in fact no more than glosses¹⁰⁹ although this seems doubtful given the capitulary's fairly extensive manuscript tradition.¹¹⁰ In no case is the meaning of the Lombard form of a capitulary significantly different from its Frankish form.

these Italian regional capitularies there circulated many capitularies issued by Charlemagne and Louis the Pious for the empire as a whole: Calasso, *MED*, p. 115; Ganshof, *Recherches*, p. 16.

¹⁰⁶*MGH Cap. I*, no. 20, pp. 47-50 exists in a *forma langobardica* known from at least 6 mss: thus Boretius intro., *MGH Cap.*, p. 47, ll. 4f.; Bougard, *Justice*, p. 37; Mordek, *Bibliotheca*, p. 1082.

¹⁰⁷Ganshof, *Recherches*, p. 17.

¹⁰⁸*MGH Cap. I*, no. 20, pp. 47-50.

¹⁰⁹Pertile, *Storia*, p. 243.

¹¹⁰Mordek, *Bibliotheca*, p. 1082 lists seven manuscripts.

The second example is less clearcut. Besta¹¹¹ states without supporting evidence that the *Admonitio generalis*¹¹² was known in Italy only in a version including corrections and additions. I am not aware of a manuscript which includes additions but he is certainly correct to note that plenty of Italian manuscripts include the capitulary in a slightly abbreviated form.¹¹³ Unfortunately the version they preserve is not consistent. Two pairs of manuscripts representing two manuscript traditions (Ivrea XXXIII and XXXIV, Gotha I.84 and Modena O.I.2) all give almost complete copies omitting only some twenty lines of the concluding comments.¹¹⁴ Wolfenbüttel inter Blank. 130 includes the *Admonitio* at two places: the first version, on fols. 73r-79r, is almost exactly the same as that above, only dropping c. 46, which appears on fol. 135r with cc. 31 and 82.¹¹⁵ The latter *capitulum* is the very lengthy concluding section of the capitulary which exhorts all to behave in a Christian fashion. I presume the extracts copied on fol. 135r were drawn from a different manuscript source. The early tenth-century Paris 4613 however omits cc. 9, 11, 26 and 27.¹¹⁶ All four of these *capitula* are explicitly stated to have been drawn from the council of Antioch (via the *Dionysio-Hadriana* collection) - but so were most of the other injunctions in the *admonitio*.¹¹⁷ It's difficult to see much pattern in these omissions. Cc. 9 and 11 both concern the limits on episcopal authority; cc. 26 and 27 reiterate that monks are not to leave the monastic life. That there is a consistent variation in the copies of this capitulary in Italian manuscripts suggests this is a real phenomenon relating to the dissemination of this capitulary. Equally, since the variations are relatively limited and evidence of 'Lombard' capitulary forms is restricted to capitularies of 779 it is very possible we are dealing with, at most, a temporary expedient. It may even be no more than

¹¹¹Besta, *Fonti*, p. 151.

¹¹²*MGH Cap I* no. 22, pp. 53-62 (a. 789).

¹¹³Mordek, *Bibliotheca*, p. 1082.

¹¹⁴Mordek, *Bibliotheca*, pp. 174, 179, 137, 262.

¹¹⁵Mordek, *Bibliotheca*, pp. 923, 940.

¹¹⁶Mordek, *Bibliotheca*, p. 473.

¹¹⁷Noted by e.g. Herrin, *Formation of Christendom*, pp. 433, 441-2.

a minor variation in the manuscript tradition of a couple of capitularies. One should not lay too much emphasis on this part of the Italian legislative tradition.

The issuing of capitularies for Italy alone is far more significant. In this practice Lombard Italy was treated differently from other Carolingian territories; its series of regional capitularies is unique in the Carolingian empire. No text explains this distinction. What inspired this separate capitulary tradition? The answer is probably *Langobardia's* status as an independent legislative zone. The new Carolingian capitulary format was certainly not entirely divorced from the Lombard legal tradition; on the contrary it interacted with the pre-existing Italian legal culture for example by borrowing Lombard terms or apparently referring back to Lombard edicts.¹¹⁸ This legal culture also expressed itself in the greater use of written documentation (charters, *placita*).¹¹⁹ Certainly later manuscript compilers thought the two traditions were related. Legal manuscripts juxtapose Lombard law and Carolingian capitularies and the *HLCG* presented Carolingian legislation as the continuation of that of the Lombard kings.¹²⁰ Note too that by Liutprand's accession the Lombard royal legislative tradition was very unusual as the only one still developing anywhere in Germanic Europe.¹²¹ Charlemagne therefore conquered the only area of Continental Latin Christendom with a living written legal tradition.¹²² Moreover, apart from Visigothic law *Lex Langobardorum* was the only Germanic code to become a territorial law rather than a personal one.¹²³ The creation of distinctive Italian capitularies after the Frankish conquest was probably therefore a result of the vigour of this Lombard legislative tradition.

¹¹⁸Editions: *Lex Langobardorum*, ed. F. Bluhme, *MGH Leges* IV (Hannover, 1868); also *MGH In Usum Scholarum*; Most recently *Leggi*, ed. Azzara.

¹¹⁹Wickham, *Early Medieval Italy*, pp. 124-7; Bougard, *Justice*, p. 25.

¹²⁰Mss e.g. Gotha, Wolfenbüttel; cf. Mordek, *Bibliotheca*, and above pp. 214f. *HLCG* see ch. II, pp. 29f.

¹²¹Except *lex salica*, apparently being re-issued by the Carolingians themselves: McKitterick, *Written Word*, pp. 40-2.

¹²²Dates of other laws of the *gentes*: McKitterick, *Written Word*, pp. 40-2 (*lex Salica*), 62 (*lex Burgundionum*, sixth century), 65 (Alemann laws, early seventh century and early eighth - pre-724 at least), 70 (*lex ribuaria* mid-seventh century).

¹²³Bougard, *Justice*, pp. 24-5.

This is again rather different from the Carolingian treatment of other 'barbarian' legislative traditions. Certainly the Carolingians regarded Lombard law as one of the ethnic laws of the *gentes*, in the same category as, say, *lex Salica*; it was treated no differently from the laws of other peoples and appears to have continued in operation alongside the capitularies which gradually replaced it. However to overplay the category difference between Lombard and Carolingian law misses the point: both capitularies and Lombard law were, in their eras, *the* royal legislation par excellence in Italy. In this sense therefore, (and quite apart from those other reasons discussed above) as the highest expression of government activity, capitularies can indeed be considered the continuation by other means of the Lombard royal legal (and perhaps governmental) tradition.¹²⁴ Recall that manuscripts place Lombard laws alongside capitularies as though they are similar texts.

In this respect Lombard law was not simply another of the ethnic laws, because it had in a sense a *Nachleben*, albeit rather limited and carried forward only by Carolingian capitularies rather than the older Lombard practice. Thus one might argue that the Frankish conquest was not so much a break as a modification. An older generation of Italian legal historians stressed the difference between *lex* and *capitula* and therefore, at least implicitly the break at 774. They associated this difference with the manner of the legislation's promulgation, claiming that *Lex* was produced at the *Volk* assembly and only with the assembly's consent, that it possessed obligatory coercive force and was the 'emanazione diretta della volontà popolare', whereas capitularies were edicts issued by the ruler alone, on the strength of his own authority, the product of the *constitutio regis*.¹²⁵ It

¹²⁴Merckel, *Geschichte*, p. 19 calls capitularies the 'Nachtrag' of Lombard law. This is also the implication of the belief in administrative continuity across 774: cf. Besta, *Fonti*, pp. 149-50; Manacorda, *Ricerche*, p. 55 calls it the continuation of a government tradition.

¹²⁵E.g. Pertile, *Storia*, p. 240; Besta, *Fonti*, pp. 230, 233-6 (quotation from 230); Calasso, *MED*, pp. 150-2; Astuti, *Lezioni*, pp. 120-2. J. Hannig, *Consensus Fidelium. Frühfeudale Interpretationen des Verhältnisses von Königtum und Adel am Beispiel des Frankenreiches*, (Monographien zur Geschichte des Mittelalters 27; Stuttgart, 1982), pp. 56-7 for a restatement of these ideas, but cf. also *contra* *ibid.* p. 17.

has even been argued that the increase in the use of certain types of capitularies, especially the *capitula legibus addenda*, indicates a decline in the importance of the assembly and a concomitant increase in the ruler's legislative power.¹²⁶ However, firstly, this categorization of capitularies is dubious.¹²⁷ Secondly more recent work concerning the way capitularies were produced has emphasized the consensual nature of capitulary promulgation.¹²⁸ The theoretical distinction between the way *Lex* was issued and the way capitularies were issued has thus largely disappeared, taking with it the 'constitutional' arguments that *lex* was more binding or consensual. Furthermore, despite the claims of some historians,¹²⁹ our knowledge of the way Lombard legislation was produced is very poor. It is therefore equally inappropriate to insist that capitularies are either a break with the Lombard tradition of legislative assemblies, or that they are so nearly the continuation of Lombard legislation that one can ignore the break in 774. My point is simply that we know too little about assemblies before 774 to safely hypothesize about differences or similarities before or after that date.

It may therefore seem that I am supporting the continuity case. There is, however, a fundamental discontinuity between Carolingian capitularies and Lombard law and this is the context in which we must interpret the capitularies under consideration. We may know little about Lombard assemblies but we *do* possess certain knowledge about the format of capitularies. In Italy capitularies were a new legislative format,¹³⁰ definitely different from Lombard legislation and introduced as a direct result of the Carolingian conquest. Thus I

¹²⁶Calasso, *MED*, p. 151.

¹²⁷See below pp. 239-42.

¹²⁸Hannig, *Consensus Fidelium*, *passim*, esp. 300; Nelson, 'Legislation and Consensus'.

¹²⁹C. G. Mor, 'Modificazioni Strutturali dell'Assemblea Nazionale Longobarda nel secolo VIII', *Italia Longobarda*, ed. G. C. Menis, (Venice, 1991), [also in Mor's *Scritti di Storia Giuridica Altomedioevale*, (Pisa, 1977), pp. 525-34] pp. 89-94, is almost entirely conjectural.

¹³⁰Pace Besta, *Fonti*, p. 150 that Liutprand's legislation concerning the *magistri comacchienses* (ed. Azzara, *Leggi*, pp. 222-7 with refs.) was a 'capitulare' - even if Besta's questionable description of this legislation is accepted one swallow doesn't make a summer. The distinction between this legislation and the rest of the Lombard code is far from apparent.

would argue that there *is* a change but we can only trace it in the format of the legislation which survives, not in the putative composition or function of assemblies.

Capitularies were not just a new format but had a fundamentally different character from Lombard law and this goes to the heart of the issue of the representation of rulers. Lombard legislators, at least superficially like Roman and modern ones, set out legal norms which were then supposed to be adhered to until they were altered. Lombard kings did *not* reiterate their laws at a later date, or at least if they did we have no record of this. Such a change in the recording of law would itself represent a substantial shift in the legal culture of Italy; hence whether we face a change in the manner of recording law or, as I believe, a change in the nature of law does not affect my argument – there is clearly still a discontinuity across 774. Traditional manuscripts of the *lex langobardorum* give the legislation of Liutprand, Ratchis and Aistulf by year of promulgation thus preserving at least the appearance of a 'rolling record' of legislative activity.¹³¹ Thus no matter how much preparation was involved, the issuing of Lombard law was recorded as an at-a-stroke event. Topics were only returned to in order to revise or alter legislation, never simply to repeat it. Hence one might characterize Lombard law as 'progressive' or more accurately 'developmental'. Carolingian capitularies on the other hand, of course repeat injunctions again and again, indeed so often that some historians have questioned the efficacy of the legislation thus produced.¹³² Carolingian capitularies often seem to have been conceived of as part of a process involving constant repetition rather than as an event.

Obviously this is too crude a distinction. Lombard legislation could certainly react to contemporary conditions (viz. Ratchis's order concerning passports, Aistulf's military

¹³¹Moreover at least one (St. Gall 730) and perhaps two (Vercelli 188) were compiled before 774 and therefore cannot have had their arrangement affected by Carolingian influence: P. J. Merkel, *Die Geschichte der Langobardenrechts*, (Berlin, 1850), pp. 18f; see Bluhme, *MGH Leges IV*, intro.; G. Moschetti, *Primordi Esetici sulla Legislazione Longobarda nel sec. IX a Verona*, (Spoleto, 1954), pp. 35-9, esp. 36-7; *Leggi*, ed. Azzara, intro. pp. xxxv-vi.

¹³²*Contra* McKitterick, *Written Word*, *passim* but esp. pp. 42-5, 47, 56.

legislation)¹³³ but never by reiterating standing edicts, only by the creation of new, hypothetically permanent, norms. Similarly, although the description of Lombard law as developmental is certainly correct, Carolingian law was often at least *partly* developmental too. It is demonstrable that in a number of fields (e.g. military campaigns, coinage, the building of fortifications)¹³⁴ or on a number of occasions (e.g. the use of Lothar's capitularies of the 820s to introduce many of the norms of the ecclesiastical reforms of Louis the Pious)¹³⁵ capitulary legislation was intended to lead to concrete changes or was designed to establish permanent legal norms; it was not simply a repetition of earlier statements, i.e. it was 'real' law. In this sense capitularies were certainly *not* merely image building.¹³⁶ Nevertheless, although only a partial characterization, the powerful reiterative element in capitularies does represent a crucial difference between them and Lombard law. One might speculate that the repetitive nature of Carolingian law was inspired by the accentuation of the legislator's religious duty of *correctio* and *emendatio*, tasks which required constant vigilance;¹³⁷ although there is certainly a strongly Christian element in the prolegomena to late Lombard legislation too, it did not feed through into the legislation itself or the format of legislation.

Repetition was not the only difference between Lombard law and capitularies. The change of format at 774 involved a concomitant change in content. Capitularies have been categorized in various ways. Bougard is critical of Boretius's categorizations (based he claims on a single use of the categorizations in 818) and has attempted a different typology

¹³³Ratchis 13, Aistulf 2, 3, 7, ed. Azzara pp. 242-5, 250-2. Wickham, *Early Medieval Italy*, p. 88.

¹³⁴Military campaigns above pp. 208f.; coins: above ch. V & Grierson & Blackburn, *MEC* I, pp. 232-3 for Charles the Bald's 864 reforms in the edict of Pîtres (*MGH Cap.* II no. 273, pp. 314-18); cf. Nelson, *Charles the Bald*, pp. 205-8.

¹³⁵Above n. 96.

¹³⁶P. Wormald, '*Lex Scripta* and *Verbum Regis*: Royal Legislation from Euric to Cnut', eds. I. Wood & P. Sawyer, *Early Medieval Kingship*, (Leeds, 1977), pp. 105-38, for an account emphasizing the ideological aspects of law as well as the practical ones.

¹³⁷Amongst many others, Astuti, *Lezioni*, p. 138 has noted the influence of Christianity on 'civil legislation' [sic]; cf. also 142.

based on content.¹³⁸ He certainly shows that capitularies cover a wide range of material which would never have been regarded as legislative under the Lombards including synods, memoranda, ecclesiastical legislation¹³⁹ and letters. Capitularies were also used for administrative measures.¹⁴⁰ They could emphasize filial piety, like Pippin's frequent invocations of his father's authority¹⁴¹ or the tradition of Carolingian legislative action; they could be used to distance the Italian ruler from rivals as did Lothar's 832 capitulary; to innovate or to appeal to the church. Indeed capitularies might be defined as almost anything the ruler chose to disseminate. The capacity of Italian capitularies to include such a broad range of materials concerning so diverse a set of issues¹⁴² is an indication of the exceptional flexibility of the capitulary format and is also another of the differences between Lombard law and capitularies. Capitularies therefore could fulfill a much wider variety of functions than Lombard law. This was a 'Carolingian' change.

This mixture of repetition and new concerns constitutes a major shift in the nature of law across 774 which seems to have gone largely unnoticed yet is probably even more significant than the incorporation of the episcopate into assemblies.¹⁴³ Sometimes this change from Lombard law to capitularies has been dismissed as merely superficial.¹⁴⁴ When considering the ruler's representation, however, even a 'superficial' change would be important. Indeed precisely such 'superficial' changes have the greatest impact on legislation's ideological role. The change in format from Lombard law to capitularies

¹³⁸Bougard, *Justice*, p. 23 & n. 22. Astuti, *Lezioni*, pp. 122-5 conveniently summarizes the traditional *MGH* categorization.

¹³⁹Admittedly some Lombard laws dealt with ecclesiastical property-holding or inheritance (e.g. Liut. 101) but, in contrast to capitularies, none concerned the spiritual regulation of ecclesiastical institutions. (The only partial exception is Liut. 95).

¹⁴⁰Cf. also Astuti, *Lezioni*, pp. 125-6.

¹⁴¹Manacorda, *Ricerche*, pp. 52, 69-70, referring to *MGH Cap.* I no. 91, p. 193, ll. 24f. and no. 94, pp. 198-9, cc. 1, 2, 8, 10.

¹⁴²Pertile, *Storia*, p. 242 comments they cover 'tutte le materie ecclesiastiche e civili'. This breadth is fundamental to Ullmann's characterization of Carolingian government as 'ecclesiological': *Kingship*, *passim*.

¹⁴³Manacorda, *Ricerche*, pp. 41-4, 50-1, 53; Tabacco, 'Il Volto', pp. 12f.

¹⁴⁴E.g. Besta, *Fonti*, p. 150, who regards it as no more than the division of the edict into chapters or articles.

therefore represents a radical shift in the way government presented itself in Lombard Italy. This is not 'superficial'.¹⁴⁵

The Purpose of the Capitularies: It may be useful to consider the purposes capitularies fulfilled in the *regnum Italiae*, firstly, from the perspective of the legislators, then from that of the legislation itself. How then were these Italian capitularies used by legislators ? They could be used to introduce new legislation, administrative measures or simply restate general principles. Sometimes Italian capitularies were used to introduce Frankish legislation into Italy. For example the articles of the 779 capitulary of Herstal discussed above, were further promulgated in the Lombard kingdom in two capitularies of, probably, 780¹⁴⁶ and c. 782,¹⁴⁷ the first issued by Charlemagne and the second by Pippin.¹⁴⁸

Only Carolingian rulers produced capitularies. I have already discussed their ideological uses. This suggests that one 'purpose' of capitularies was to legitimize the ruler who issued them. However beyond the specific cases discussed earlier it is difficult to generalize about this use of capitularies. Capitulary promulgation varied. Charlemagne and Pippin promulgated capitularies both together and separately; sometimes Pippin repeated articles from his father's capitularies; sometimes Charlemagne legislated for Italy alone, more usually he did not. Strikingly, in comparison to Charlemagne's practice, Louis the Pious *never* specifically issued capitularies for Italy alone. Nevertheless even without visiting the *regnum* personally or using the Italian tradition his capitularies circulated in the peninsula.¹⁴⁹ Indeed Charlemagne was the only senior Carolingian to devote any effort to Italian capitularies after the establishment of a sub-ruler by issuing capitularies alongside those of Pippin. There appears to have been a

¹⁴⁵Pace Besta, *Fonti*, p. 152. Even he acknowledges the importance of some of these changes, such as the inclusion of ecclesiastical legislation.

¹⁴⁶*MGH Cap.* I no. 90, pp. 190-1.

¹⁴⁷*MGH Cap.* I no. 91, pp. 191-3.

¹⁴⁸Manacorda, *Ricerche*, pp. 43-50, 61.

¹⁴⁹Cf. the ms. index of Mordek, *Bibliotheca*, pp. 1094f.

division of labour after Louis the Pious's accession; thereafter the senior ruler never issued Italian capitularies after the establishment of a sub-ruler in Italy. Thus after 822 Louis left Italian legislation entirely to Lothar¹⁵⁰ (Louis the Pious's interest in Italy before this date was never legislative anyway, only political);¹⁵¹ Lothar, likewise left the production of Italian capitularies to Louis II after 844.¹⁵² These withdrawals by the senior Carolingian rulers from the Italian legislative arena following the setting-up of their sons would appear to suggest that the production of Italian capitularies was a junior function after 814.

However beyond this there does not seem to be any 'constitutional' issue. Lothar might have legislated alone in Italy by virtue of his imperial title, however we know of no legislation by Lothar alone for anywhere else in the empire. Therefore during his joint rule with his father Lothar appears to have been permitted to legislate independently *only* for Italy - a strikingly narrow interpretation of the imperial title assuming it was the imperial title which conferred the right to issue capitularies. In practical terms then there seems to be little to choose between the grounds on which the emperor Lothar I and king Pippin produced Italian capitularies. Obviously the question of non-Italian capitularies never arose for Louis II but he did issue capitularies before receiving the imperial title,¹⁵³ (as well, of course, as later) which seems to confirm that merely royal status did not impede the right to legislate. The most reasonable interpretation of all this is that any Carolingian stationed in Italy and given some kind of formal ruler's role would probably issue capitularies. The capitularies in question were, unsurprisingly,

¹⁵⁰Ganshof, *Recherches*, p. 17: 'si Louis le Pieux a publié des capitulaires après 829 ils n'ont été «reçus» en Italie' - nor indeed anywhere else.

¹⁵¹Which is to say his Italian concerns were almost all linked to Bernard: Werner, 'Hludovicus Augustus', pp. 31f. for an interesting account.

¹⁵²*Contra* Ganshof, *Recherches*, p. 18 who states incorrectly that Lothar's Italian capitularies were 'publiés après la morte de son père'. In fact Lothar issued no Italian capitularies after 832 although this may reflect the general absence of capitularies from the late 830.

¹⁵³*MGH Cap.* II, n. 210, pp. 80-3, at 80, l.35, (a. 844-50), which refers to Louis as *gloriosus rex*.

intended for an Italian audience, an idea supported by the fact Italian capitularies are not known from any non-Italian manuscripts.

Given the ambiguity concerning who issued them, the purpose of Italian capitularies can be approached by asking instead what was the relationship of Italian capitularies to those for the rest of the empire. The Italian capitulary tradition was only significant under Charlemagne and Louis the Pious until 829,¹⁵⁴ when capitulary legislation was supposedly a unity. After 840 East and West Frankia also began to legislate as units in their own right (although we know virtually nothing about East Frankish capitularies¹⁵⁵) and Italian capitularies therefore became just one regional tradition amongst several. Thus the Italian tradition flourished alongside the 'Frankish' one. Neither Louis nor later Lothar made any attempt to incorporate the Italian legislative tradition within that of the rest of the empire and eliminate the practice of legislating for Italy alone. This non-integration of Italy into the rest of the empire's legislative processes might at first seem at odds with my earlier comments about Louis's reform programme from 814-20 and its repetition for an Italian legal environment in Lothar's capitularies from 822-8 because this repetition suggests law was seen as an empire-wide norm to be promulgated everywhere. The next logical step would seem to be to 'rationalize' the production of laws¹⁵⁶ by ending the anomaly of legislating for Italy separately. However there is no evidence of any effort at such a rationalization. Possibly to assume that such a rationalization was the logical outcome of the legislative practices of Louis the Pious's reign down to c.830 would be to mistake the essentially spiritual models and aims of Louis's legislation¹⁵⁷ with the administrative means used to promulgate them. The dissemination of the reforming norms was more important than the variations in the ways they were issued. As long as the system worked it didn't

¹⁵⁴Ganshof, *Recherches*, p. 16.

¹⁵⁵Reuter, *Germany in the Early Middle Ages*, p. 89.

¹⁵⁶Thus Calasso, *MED*, pp. 153-4.

¹⁵⁷T. F. X. Noble, 'The Monastic Ideal as the Model for Empire: the Case of Louis the Pious', *Revue Bénédictine* 86 (1976), pp. 235-50, esp. 248-9.

matter if one or two local peculiarities survived. As in other fields¹⁵⁸ the Carolingian objective was unity through harmony rather than absolute uniformity of practice.

This brings us on to the question of the perception of the images projected by the capitularies. The capitulary format's flexibility makes it hard to generalize. Conversely, if the 'meaning' of each capitulary is so dependent on its specific context, capitularies must have been ideal ideological vehicles. In this regard the almost exclusive use of the Italian capitulary tradition by junior rulers after 814 is an important point when taken in conjunction with my earlier emphasis on repetition. The use of capitularies to reiterate earlier injunctions or to apply in Italy those of the senior ruler had one major ideological effect: they enabled the sub-ruler to place himself in the dynastic legislative tradition. This is a point of more than merely juridical interest. Political history in Carolingian Italy is above all socio-institutional in character.¹⁵⁹ Given the substantial absence of other sources about government,¹⁶⁰ capitulary evidence is crucial to any discussion of the institutions of government and their activity in the *regnum Italiae*. Hence their role in the historiography of Carolingian Italy is disproportionately important. Several of the key themes of eighth- and ninth-century Italian historiography, such as the decline of the *arimanni*, the rise in importance of the bishops, the loss of monarchical control over the secular aristocracy and consequently 'the failure of the state', all rely at least at some point on capitulary evidence. But as the example of Louis II's earliest capitularies suggests, analysis of government activity which is heavily based on capitulary 'readings' can suffer radical reinterpretation with especially broad effects because of the peculiarities of Italian historiography.

Capitularies and the Carolingians - Representations and Perceptions: Bonacini has appreciated the programmatic nature of many Carolingian capitularies. He perceives a substantial continuity in the purpose of capitulary legislation: to create effective 'public

¹⁵⁸On liturgical diversity within the empire being perfectly acceptable: McKitterick, 'Unity and Diversity and the Carolingian Church', *Studies in Church History* 32 (1996), pp. 59-82, esp. 81-2.

¹⁵⁹See above ch. I.

¹⁶⁰See ch. I, p. 22.

insitutions' [sic]. This is the purpose of the injunctions concerning public officials, the right to royal justice and even the rights of the weak. Having corrected the problems arising from 774¹⁶¹ the administration was to 'incorporate' the Lombards (presumably into the government machine) and to organize respect for the law and swift action on disputes. Bonacini is forced to acknowledge that the administration was very diversified, irregular and regionalized; he focusses on the difficulty of implementing the capitulary programme.¹⁶² Bonacini's analysis is, dare one say it, very historiographically 'Italian' and certainly as is evident from his notes, much-influenced by Tabacco. Like Tabacco, Bonacini is interested in the societal effects of the development of Carolingian administration. For him capitularies are a source of governmental aims. While this is undoubtedly a more reasonable use of them than has sometimes been the case, Bonacini's use of the capitularies as evidence for the progress of government projects is more disquieting. He uses *placita* as evidence for the efficacy, or otherwise, of the programme derived from capitularies and concludes that the spirit of Carolingian legislation was never really accepted and in fact the poor gradually became even more open to oppression as society became increasingly rigidly stratified. Louis II's capitulary denunciations of the oppression of the weak are cited as evidence of this.¹⁶³ This interpretation of the progressive decline of state power has a considerable historiography.¹⁶⁴ However, here using capitularies to try and 'track' government in this way is dangerous. Louis II's repetition of the injunctions of earlier rulers makes it difficult to infer a direct relationship between the wording of his legislation and the situation on the ground. Indeed Keller has actually suggested a widening of the social base of government under Louis II.¹⁶⁵

¹⁶¹Discussed also by Manacorda, *Ricerche*, pp. 36-43.

¹⁶²P. Bonacini, 'Giustizia Pubblica e Società nell'Italia Carolingia', *Quaderni Medievali* 31-2 (1991), pp. 6-35 at 8-10 & n.8.

¹⁶³Bonacini, 'Giustizia', pp. 32-4.

¹⁶⁴E.g. Tabacco, *Struggle*, p. 133.

¹⁶⁵Keller, 'Consilarii Regis'.

Carolingian capitularies produced a very different picture of government in comparison to the Lombard laws. They covered a range of issues never dealt with by *lex langobardorum*, such as the coinage and fortifications. Lombard laws seem therefore to have been conceived of more to regulate disputes than to establish norms. This last topic is particularly important. Capitularies present an interventionist image of a government far more concerned with the moral welfare of its people than the Lombard rulers had been, and which took explicit responsibility for the proper ordering of ecclesiastical institutions. Carolingian capitularies therefore offered an ideological vehicle which emphasized the religious duties of the ruler, indeed which arguably interpreted their whole government in such terms.¹⁶⁶ In this light the change from *lex* to *capitula* after 774 is profoundly important for the representation of the ruler. The 'ambiguity' of the institutions thus created, that blurring of the line between the functions of episcopate and ruler which exercised Tabacco,¹⁶⁷ was deliberate. Beyond this one should be cautious. There is no overall 'constitutional' significance to the way law was issued in Carolingian Italy. Of course there were many continuities which have often been stressed in the historiography - perhaps too much so. Law (and the political significance of its promulgation in the form of capitularies) changed from reign to reign, sometimes even during particular reigns. Charlemagne and Pippin, Louis the Pious and Lothar, or Lothar and Louis II as legislators all constructed their relationships on different lines. This reflected political and governmental concerns rather than juridical ones. I have sought to emphasize however, that only by taking all three of these aspects of the legislation into consideration can we approach the capitulary evidence realistically.

There is one final further complicating factor. Particularly in some of the capitularies from Charlemagne's reign it is clear that Carolingian legislation was not always easily received in Italy. Charlemagne wrote to the Italian aristocracy ordering them to enforce

¹⁶⁶Thus of course, the description of Carolingian government as 'ecclesiological': Ullmann, *Kingship*, *passim*; cf. Morrison, *Two Kingdoms*.

¹⁶⁷Tabacco, 'L'ambiguità', *passim*.

some of the clauses of the capitulary of Herstal,¹⁶⁸ and later to Pippin to order him to enforce capitularies¹⁶⁹ and good order, while on another occasion the Italian version of a Frankish capitulary was modified, apparently in line with Lombard law.¹⁷⁰ This has all been interpreted as evidence that the Italian aristocracy was not just passively receptive to Carolingian legislation.¹⁷¹ Let us consider this evidence. In the first example above Bougard seeks to portray as positive an interpretation as possible for the strength of central government by commenting that the complaint 'ne s'agit-il que de quatre *capitula* sur vingt-trois'.¹⁷² He appears to imply that because only four *capitula* are referred to one can assume that there were no problems with the other nineteen. There are several other possibilities. It might simply be that no other complaints had reached him, or that these particular clauses were considered the most important, or even simply that this was a kind of 'circular' reminder. We cannot know but nor can we presume that silence betokens satisfaction.

The second example which allegedly reveals the aristocracy 'resisting' Carolingian edicts also draws our attention to the difficult question of how capitularies circulated. A first point is that we cannot be certain what 'resistance' to legislation means - perhaps ignoring the law rather than explicitly refusing it. Bougard¹⁷³ doubts the aristocratic resistance interpretation anyway and assumes that it was Pippin who had failed to circulate the texts in question rather than the aristocracy resisting their enactment. This again presumes the importance of central government in the promulgation of capitularies although in this case it means Pavia rather than Aachen. This in turn assumes that capitularies in Italy must have been circulated via the junior ruler and that his action was

¹⁶⁸MGH Cap. I, no. 97, pp. 203-4; Manacorda, *Ricerche*, pp. 43-7.

¹⁶⁹MGH Cap. I, no. 103, pp. 211-12 (a. 806); cf. below.

¹⁷⁰Besta, *Fonti*, p. 151.

¹⁷¹Manacorda, *Ricerche*, p. 101 n. 259 with regard to Cap no. 103 comments 'la lettera testimonia...che i funzionari italici non intendevano 'pro lege tenere' quelle disposizioni'.

¹⁷²Bougard, *Justice*, p. 27.

¹⁷³Bougard, *Justice*, p. 29: 'Charlemagne met moins en cause dans sa lettre les officiers du royaume que Pépin lui-même'.

crucial to their implementation. This would certainly explain why Charlemagne wrote to Pippin. But why would Pippin circulate a letter from his father which was so critical of his (?in-)activity and presumably damaging to his prestige? Pippin could have simply circulated the edicts without further comment. But the letter survives in two independent manuscripts and in the eleventh century passed into the *Liber Papiensis*. Since many capitulary manuscripts are probably 'private' works¹⁷⁴ this implies capitularies were fairly widely circulated.¹⁷⁵ Alternatively if Charlemagne bypassed Pippin's administration and circulated the letter himself directly the problem of Pippin's administration issuing negative propaganda about itself would not arise.

Bougard, however, interprets the letter as a complaint about Pippin's failure to circulate capitularies. But why didn't the emperor simply circulate the capitularies as well ? In fact the dissemination of the letter *at all* suggests that Pippin was not its only target: it was a 'public' document intended to reach the kind of 'capitulary audience' we can partly reconstruct from manuscripts. Bougard's concentration on the later section of the letter is misleading. The letter does after all criticize Italian aristocrats for *multe oppressiones* against churches rather than for failing to implement the capitulary edicts in question. The passage asking Pippin to circulate the *capitula* under discussion leaves unclear whether he should have done this before: *...monemus tuam amabilem dilectionem, ut per universum regnum tibi a Deo commissum ea [i.e. ipsa capitula] nota facias et oboedire atque implere praecipias...*¹⁷⁶ It seems equally reasonable to explain this as an action by Charlemagne to ensure that the laws in question were widely known and that there could be no excuse for disobeying them. Perhaps the traditional interpretation is correct and the aristocracy really were the target of the letter. A solution to the problem is that Charlemagne was effectively ordering Pippin to crack down on his *potentes* and Pippin then circulated the letter to publicize the forthcoming action. This requires us to

¹⁷⁴Above pp. 214-20.

¹⁷⁵Bougard, *Justice*, p. 37.

¹⁷⁶*MGH Cap.* I, no. 103, p. 212, ll. 14-15.

completely abandon Bougard's interpretation but it squares the circle concerning Pippin's alleged 'publication' of a letter critical of his government.

This capitulary/letter therefore poses in acute form one of the difficulties concerning just how capitularies were disseminated and/or used for ideological purposes. The suggestion put forward by Besta and more recently by Mordek that capitularies were preserved in private copies adds to the problem.¹⁷⁷ There is no later evidence of Italian resistance to capitularies however. I believe this may be significant.

If the Italian aristocracy were indeed resisting certain pieces of legislation this should not surprise us. It is another aspect of the emphasis on consensus in the promulgation of legislation. Despite my earlier strictures concerning the character of capitularies they obviously *could* function as legislation. Hence, since these norms might have coercive force the political elite obviously had a major interest in the content of the laws. Both the rhetoric of consensus and the Italian evidence strongly imply that aristocrats translated interest in the laws into involvement in the framing of law. To some extent therefore capitularies must have been the result of a compromise between the *potentes* and the ruler, not necessarily in the sense of the two parties actively hammering out their differences but in a more subtle way. Both sides came to know the limits of the other's tolerance and shaped their statements accordingly. The difficulties in Charlemagne's reign were the result of tacit negotiations about what was and, as no. 103 shows, what was not acceptable.

If capitulary legislation was the product of both the ruler and his elite, this may explain the decreasing novelty of Carolingian legislation. Capitularies increasingly came to be cast in the mould of earlier capitularies. Under Charlemagne new relationships were being negotiated. Later Carolingians had the benefit (and restriction) of operating within parameters largely established before them. Thus rather than, like older historians, seeing a progressive decline in the capacity of the state to enforce its legal claims to prevent

¹⁷⁷Only a full-scale analysis of all the approximately thirty early medieval Italian manuscripts containing capitularies could offer some resolution of the question but this is a substantial project in its own right.

violence, oppression and so forth, we should consider later Carolingian capitularies as a legislative restatement along traditional lines acceptable to both ruler and elite.

It is of course possible that this decline reflects the fact that those capitularies chosen for preservation in surviving manuscripts were selected because they were 'traditional'. Compilers were presumably overwhelmingly *potentes* or acting for them. Thus either the monarch was only issuing 'traditional' capitularies, or the compilers of capitulary manuscripts chose to preserve only 'traditional' capitularies. In the first case the 'negotiated' arrangement between monarch and aristocracy found expression in the form of uncontentious capitularies. In the second the silence of our manuscripts may reflect the aristocracy's resistance. The only exception to this would be if the survival of material was entirely random. However if selection was carried out by the compilers then the initial corpus of material from which our survivors is drawn would not be a random selection. Moreover if survival was genuinely random there is no reason why 'traditional' capitularies would be more likely to survive than innovative ones. Either way capitularies can offer an insight into the attitudes of both the ruler and the political elite. In this sense once again we find that representation and perception elide because the representation of Carolingian rulers in capitularies was to an extent dependent on what their elite was willing to tolerate and record.

Finally, how does all this relate to the representation of the Carolingians in Italy ? Generally the decline in the power of the state has been regarded in apocalyptic terms. Many historians have taken the Carolingian era as the end-point of antique structures and have consequently seen the end of a tradition. Those who have looked forwards have often compared the 'barbarous' or 'Dark Age' Carolingians with the 'rational' high middle ages which either prefigure or themselves participated in some sort of 'Renaissance'. Cassandras emphasize the repeated injunctions about the poor and the defenceless; Marxists emphasize the attempts to maintain the much-frayed fabric of public life. This is

where we must return to the question of the rhetoric of power as expressed in the capitularies.

Without being in uncritical agreement with it, one can acknowledge, in a very different context, the essential truth of Edward Said's formulation that 'the rhetoric of power all too easily produces an illusion of benevolence when deployed in an imperial setting'.¹⁷⁸ Such was surely at least partly the case in Carolingian Italy. To take one typical example, protecting the poor was a traditional ruler's role. If Tabacco's analysis of the decline of the *arimanni* is correct, the ruler had indeed a vested interest in protecting the weaker members of society since their appeal to his authority counterbalanced the dangers of aristocratic domination independent of royal or imperial sanction. It also imprinted Carolingian rule with what Said terms 'benevolence', which in turn served to justify and legitimize Carolingian control. Recall that the *HLCG*, a text almost certainly intended as an introduction to a legal manuscript, concluded that the Carolingians had made Italy flourish as in ancient times.¹⁷⁹ Modern scholars have tended to be much less sanguine about such claims but this was the kind of image Carolingian capitularies sought to propagate. It was an image of a morally-concerned interventionist government. It was furthermore a very different image from that of the Lombard regime. As indicated earlier, even if we presume that assembly decisions of the Lombard era were essentially similar to those after 774, and and that therefore Carolingian capitularies represent no more than the recording of such decisions the mere fact of their being recorded is itself an important change in the representation of power. There is of course no evidence of such 'Lombard capitularies' whereas ninth-century copies of Lombard law are numerous. It is possible that the survival of Carolingian capitularies documents no more than the post-774 incorporation into the processes of government in Italy of the main medieval record-keeping institution, the Church; however this would not explain why copies of Lombard

¹⁷⁸E. W. Said, *Culture and Imperialism*, (London, 1993), p. xix.

¹⁷⁹See ch. II, p. 35.

law survive but hypothetical Lombard capitularies do not. The simplest explanation is that no such genre ever existed. This implies a different relationship between the promulgation of government action and its preservation in written form by the *potentes*.

In a sense all capitularies and all capitulary manuscripts are representations of the Carolingians. However we can approach the capitularies only through 'private' manuscripts, hence our image of the Carolingians is itself conditioned by the selections made by manuscript compilers. The vagaries of the manuscript tradition make this problem even more difficult. Compilers were themselves constrained by the capitulary texts available to them, almost certainly at best only a selection of all those issued. The south Italian manuscripts show capitularies quickly became part of that body of venerable 'good old law' upon which medieval people drew. Our understanding of the compilers' perceptions of the Carolingians is heavily based on subtle decisions they made as to which texts to copy. Thus we face again the further problem that on occasion compilers edited or glossed capitularies for reasons which have nothing to do with capitularies as representations of the Carolingians. The reiterative aspects of capitularies certainly show however that, whatever else the texts were intended to indicate, they were especially useful as a means of associating particular Carolingian rulers in the tradition of good government and they did this in the most various of ways. This makes them difficult to generalize about but at the same time shows what excellent ideological media they were.

VII

Coda

*Hic finitum est regnum Langobardorum et incoavit regnum Italiae...*¹ By c. 806 at least one writer had explicitly seen 774 as the end of an era. This idea is such a historiographical commonplace in modern works that it seems banal. But the *HLCG*'s comment is I believe the first time it was stated in an Italian source. In many ways the surprising point is that it took more than three decades to articulate the idea so clearly (although given the absence of Italian sources from the first quarter-of-a-century of Carolingian domination perhaps this should not be so unexpected). The rulers of north Italy changed in 774. The main purpose of this thesis has been to explore and understand some of the changes in their representation and perception which followed 774. It is a historiographical commonplace that the system I have thus attempted to describe broke down just after 875; the kingdom split apart, the institutions of the state withered, the regions prospered. In this sense the ideology I have tried to describe failed. However the question of why it failed (and to what extent the failure of the state was an ideological one) is an interesting one in itself; regrettably it was outside the scope of this thesis. However the first step towards understanding that process is to outline the ideology which failed and this is what has been attempted above. In this regard I have not so much solved the problem as simply tried to delineate it.

In order to achieve this I have taken the regional fragments of evidence of this ideology and contextualise them alongside each other as common expressions of the same thing. The evidence about the Carolingians in Italy has never been assembled in this way before because the historiographical focus has been so resolutely local. One thus builds up a 'national' picture of the Carolingians. By using sources such as capitularies I sought to take account of both the image 'transmitted' as well as that 'received'. This overview must be

¹*HLCG* c. 9.

treated with some care. It cannot be entirely coherent. It comes from a series of different places at different times; it is also affected by genre [below] and more prosaically, survival.

Too much remains to be done for this section to be called a conclusion. Various sources have been left untouched: Papal sources, charters (both imperial and local), palaeography in the wider sense and expressions of imperial piety and charity are all areas which could be exploited. Perhaps most important of all is the Lombard inheritance. This problem is both broad and diffuse. Conversely however this study has concentrated on narrative and literary sources, coins and capitularies. The consideration of these sources does offer a broader overview than ever before of the ideological framework and impact of the early medieval north Italian kingdom. Finally, rather than claiming my closing comments as definitive I would prefer to consider them as summaries of and reflections upon what has gone before.

The chapters on historical narratives reveal that for most writers of historical texts the Carolingians were of only peripheral concern. An important exception is the work of Andreas of Bergamo which, although often held to be unsatisfactory in terms of information, is almost entirely constructed around the activities of the monarchy. Mostly, however, these texts really only enable us to perceive the Carolingians in a limited number of ways. For example the two 'legal' texts, the *HLCG* and the *libellus*, both show that legal and administrative affairs were, unsurprisingly, closely bound up with the Carolingian dynasty. Elsewhere the Carolingians appear as great and powerful rulers especially associated with the fight against the Arabs. From this perspective Louis the Pious and Lothar I however are almost entirely invisible while Louis II enjoys the lion's share of the attention.

The limitations of our material are perhaps never more explicit than in the field of more general literary productions. Not one surviving work can be decisively attributed a court origin (although one may suspect that the Avar verses were indeed written with the court in mind). Most of our texts deal with the Carolingians only as adjuncts to their authors'

primarily local concerns: the *Versus de Verona* (a text into which much has been read) and *Versus Aquileienses* include single lines about contemporary Carolingian rulers but the Lombard era *Versus Mediolanensis* acts as a useful corrective here. It refers to Liutprand - mentioning the current king may have been standard literary practice. Although such casual references show the widespread awareness of the Carolingians it is difficult to claim that there is much which is unusual or innovative about these works. However the non-court origin of these works does show how widely-disseminated were images of the Carolingians.

The numismatic and capitulary evidence approaches the problem from a different perspective. These 'texts' are in large measure the product of government itself, albeit in the case of capitularies mediated by 'private' manuscript compilers. The Italian capitulary tradition is partially distinct from that for the rest of the empire, but its ideological content is not especially unusual; it shows plenty of textual associations with 'Frankish' capitularies and its overall ideological tenor is comparable to that of the rest of the Carolingian capitularies. This reveals something of the image Carolingian government hoped to propagate. The *HLCG* seems to show that the Carolingian capitulary tradition was clearly both acceptable and enthusiastically accepted at ground level. In terms of promulgation, law was an uncontentious matter for the dynasty; although as capitulary no. 103 reveals, reception was sometimes another thing. Again however, both the *HLCG* itself and the capitularies themselves also show that again the Carolingians were here the heirs of the Lombard rulers.

Throughout this study the Lombard inheritance has been an insistent secondary problem which I have had to bypass in order to focus on the Carolingian material. The Carolingians clearly took over the executive functions (if one can dignify them with such a grandiose description) of the Lombard monarchy. Hence the historiography's emphasis on governmental continuity after the Frankish conquest. Thus one can certainly make a claim that the shift from Lombard to Carolingian dominance was indeed a smooth 'elision'.

However the Carolingians also had to limit authority over those executive functions to their own family - a marked difference from before 774. There are two other ways of considering this. As the Beneventan gold coinage reminds us, we cannot simply assume that continuity of form equalled continuity of meaning. It is above all the absence of 'court' or 'central' texts which defines our ignorance. It may well be that the sort of radical redefinition of meaning which the dukes of Benevento achieved with their coinage was likewise produced by the Carolingians in the former *regnum Langobardorum*. Thus it may be that although we cannot see it, the Carolingians successfully transformed one government tradition into another. Yet at the same time they may have intended to maintain the good old traditions of government so as to pacify the Lombard elite, especially in the delicate early stages of consolidation.

The questions of meaning and inheritance are obviously related to that of reception. The codicology, palaeography and, generally, inspiration of these works make it very difficult to attribute them convincingly to any particular audience. Furthermore even when such attempts have been made I am sceptical of their value. If, for example, we presume that Erchempert wrote for the community of Montecassino, there seems to me to be little relationship between his chosen model, Paul the Deacon, and the audience for which he wrote. Rather the relationship exists between his subject matter, 'Lombard' politics, and a model which itself partly defined the material for inclusion. The author chose a text as model (or at least nominated such a text - the extent to which the model furnished anything more than a convenient intellectual prop is open to doubt) and the text then at least partly-defined the field of enquiry. Sometimes, as with Andreas of Bergamo, the model was read in a very particular way: in his epitome of Paul the Deacon's *Historia Langobardorum* Andreas ignored all the non-royal material, radically reworking an ethnic history into a monarchical one. Thus Andreas and Erchempert writing almost contemporaneously at opposite ends of Carolingian Italy used the same text as their model but in utterly different ways. How any of this relates to audience is, at best, moot.

With regard to understanding perceptions of the Carolingians, this conclusion at least avoids perpetuating questionable attributions and the conclusions based upon them. I would therefore complete this thesis by commenting that there are only two ways of carrying forward the approach I have tried to use. Firstly, as I indicated, it should be possible to spread the analysis over sets of sources I have omitted. Secondly, probably even more importantly, the interpretation of those sources can be calibrated against a broader cultural history of early medieval Italy which should try to take account of Byzantine and classical influences as well as Lombard ones. Finally, as this thesis has partly sought to do, such a history would, one hopes, place special emphasis on the link between the regions and the centre. This link is the one which determined the existence of the *regnum Italiae*; indeed, in one sense, the whole history of the north Italian kingdom in the ninth century might be said to constitute the description of the severing of this relationship. Its dissolution c. 900 can be regarded as the most important event in Italian medieval history. No durable polity of comparable scale arose in north Italy for a millennium until, again, an ideological force of comparable power shaped its creation.

Bibliography - Primary Sources

Agnellus of Ravenna, *Liber Pontificalis Ecclesiae Ravennatis*, ed. O. Holder-Egger, *MGH SS RL*, pp. 275-391.

Andreas of Bergamo, *Historia*, ed. G. Pertz, *MGH SS RL*, pp. 221-30.

Annales Bertiniani, ed. G. Waitz, *MGH Ex Usum Scholarum*, (Hannover, 1883).

Annales Fuldenses, eds. G. Pertz & F. Kurze, *MGH Ex Usum Scholarum*, (Hannover, 1891).

Annales Regni Francorum, eds. G. Pertz & F. Kurze, *MGH Ex Usum Scholarum*, (Hannover, 1895).

Astronomer, *Vita Hludowici Imperatoris*, ed. G. Pertz, *MGH SS II*, pp. 607-48.

Chronica Monasterii Casinensis, ed. H. Hoffmann, *MGH SS XXXIV*, (Hannover, 1980).

Chronica Sancti Benedicti Casinesis, ed. G. Waitz, *MGH SS RL*, pp. 468- 82.

Chronicon Brixienne, ed. G. Pertz, *MGH SS III*, pp. 238-40.

Chronicon Novaliciense, ed. *MGH SS VII*, pp. 73f.

Chronicon Salernitanum: a Critical Edition with Studies on Literacy and Historical Sources and on Language, ed. U. Westerbergh (*Studia Latina Stockholmiensia III*; 1956).

Codice Diplomatico Longobardo, 2 vols., ed. L. Schiaparelli, (Rome; vol. 1, *FSI* 62, 1929; vol. 2, *FSI* 63, 1933).

Disputatio Pippini cum Albino, eds. L. W. Daly & W. Suchier, *Altercatio Hadriani, Augustie et Epicteti Philosophi* (Urbana, 1939), pp. 137-43.

Edictus Ceteraque Langobardorum leges cum constitutionibus et pactis principum Beneventanorum, ed. F. Bluhme, (Hannover, 1869); new edition in C. Azzara, *Le Leggi dei Longobardi: Storia, Memoria e Diritto di un Popolo Germanico*, (Milan, 1992).

Einhard, *Vita Karoli Magni*, ed. O. Holder-Egger, *MGH Ex Usum Scholarum*, (Hannover, Leipzig, 1911).

Erchempert of Montecassino, *Historia Langobardorum Beneventanorum*, ed. G. Pertz, G. Waitz, *MGH SS RL*, pp. 234-64.

Giovanni Diacono, *Cronaca Veneziana*, in *Cronache Veneziane Antichissime*, ed. G. Monticolo, (FSI 9.1; Rome, 1890), pp. 59-171.

Hincmar, *De ordine palatii*, ed. T. Gross & R. Schieffer, *MGH Fontes* (Hannover, 1980).

Historia Langobardorum Codicis Gothanis, ed. G. Waitz, *MGH SS RL*, pp. 7-11; new ed. Azzara, pp. 282-9.

Johannes Diaconus, *Gesta Episcoporum Neapolitanorum*, ed. G. Waitz, *MGH SS RL*, pp. 402-436.

Libellus de Imperatoria Potestate in Urbe Roma, ed. G. Pertz, *MGH SS III*, pp. 719-22. New edition ed. G. Zucchetti, *Il Chronicon di Benedetto, monaco di S. Andrea del Soratte e il Libellus de imperatoria potestate in urbe roma*, (FSI 55; Rome 1920), pp. 191-210.

Liber Pontificalis, ed. L. Duchesne, 3 vols., (Paris, 1886-92).

Ludovici II Diplomata, ed. K. Wanner, *FSI Antiquitates 3* (Rome, 1994).

MGH Capitularia Regum Francorum, tom. I, ed. A. Boretius, (Hannover, 1883).

MGH Capitularia Regum Francorum, tom. II, eds. A. Boretius & V. Krause, (Hannover, 1897).

MGH Capitularia Regum Francorum, nova series tom. I. *Die Kapitulariensammlung des Ansegis*, ed. G. Schmitz, (Hannover, 1996).

MGH Diplomata Karolinorum I: Pippini, Carlomanni, Carolomagni Diplomata, ed. E. Mühlbacher, (Hannover, 1906).

MGH Diplomata Karolinorum III: Die Urkunden Lothars I und Lothars II, ed. T. Schieffer, (Berlin, 1966).

MGH Epistolae, Epistolae Karolini Aevi, t.II ed. E. Duemmler, (Berlin, 1895); vol.IV (Berlin, 1925); *Epistolarum VII Epistolae Karolini Aevi* vol. V (Berlin, 1928).

MGH Poetae Latini Aevi Carolini, vol. I ed. E. Duemmler, (Berlin, 1881).

MGH Poetae Latini Aevi Carolini, vol. III.1 ed. L. Traube, (Berlin, 1886).

MGH Poetae Latini Aevi Carolini, vol. III.2 ed. L. Traube, (Berlin, 1892).

MGH Poetae Latini Aevi Carolini, vol. IV ed. K. Strecker (Berlin, 1923).

MGH Scriptores Rerum Langobardicarum, ed. G. Waitz, (Hannover, 1878).

Muratori A. ed., *Antiquitates Italicarum*, (17).

Notker Balbulus, *Gesta Karoli Magni*, ed. H. Haefele, (*MGH Ex Usum Scholarum*, Berlin, 1959).

Origo Gentis Langobardorum, ed. G. Waitz, *MGH SS RL* pp. 1-6; new ed. Azzara, *Le Leggi dei Longobardi*, pp. 2-7.

Passio SS. Faustini et Jovitae (*AASS Jan I 751, Feb. II*, 805-21; also edited by F. Savio in *Analecta Bollandiana* 15 (1896) pp. 5f, 113f., 377f

Paul the Deacon, *Historia Langobardorum*, *MGH Ex Usum Scholarum*, (Hannover, 1878); new edn. by L. Capo, (Fondazione Valla, 1992).

Paul the Deacon, *Historia Romana*, ed. H. Droysen, (*MGH Ex Usum Scholarum*; Berlin, 1879).

Paul the Deacon, *Liber de Episcopis Mettensibus*, ed. G. Pertz, *MGH SS II*, pp. 260-8.

I Placiti del Regnum Italiae, vol. I, ed. C. Manaresi, (*FSI 92*; Rome, 1955).

Rythmus de S. Zenoni, *PL* 11, 204-6 = *MGH PLAC IV* ed. K. Strecker, no. LI, pp. 577-80.

Vita Athanasii Episcopi Neapolitani, ed. G. Waitz, *MGH SS RL*, pp. 439-49.

Bibliography - Secondary Works

Note the various *Storie di*...[+town name] are listed under *Storia* rather than by editor.

Amore A. 1964 'Faustino e Giovitta', *Bibliotheca Sanctorum* vol. V, (Rome) cols. 483-5.

Andreolli M. P. 1966 'Una Pagina di Storia Ancora: Re Ratchis', *Nuova Rivista Storica* 50, pp. 281-327.

Anton H. H. 1968 *Fürstenspiegel und Herrscherethos in der Karolingerzeit*, (Bonner Historischer Studien 32).

Arcari P. M. 1968 *Idee e Sentimenti Politici dell'Alto Medioevo*, (Milan).

Arnaldi G. 1968 'Regnum Langobardorum - Regnum Italiae', *L'Europe aux IXe-XIe siècles: aux Origines des États Nationaux*, (Warsaw), pp. 105-22.

Arnaldi G. 1977 'Il Papato e l'Ideologia del Potere Imperiale', *Nascità dell'Europa ed Europa Carolingia: Un'Equazione da Verificare* (SSpol 27,1977 - publ. 1981), pp. 341-407.

Astuti G. 1953 *Lezioni di storia del diritto italiano. Le fonti. Età Romano-Barbarica*, (Padova).

Arslan E. 1978 *Le Monete di Ostrogoti, Longobardi e Vandali. Catalogo delle Civiche Raccolte Numismatiche di Milano*, (Milan).

Arslan E. 1986 'Sequenze dei Conii e Valutazioni Quantitative delle Monetazioni Argentea ed Aurea di Benevento Longobarda', *Rythmes de la Production Monétaire de l'Antiquité à nos jours*, eds. G. Depeyrot, T. Hackens, G. Moucharte, (Actes du Colloque Internationale, Paris 10-12 Jan. 1986; publ. Louvain-la-Neuve, 1987). (Numismatica Lovaniensia 7), pp. 387-410.

Astuti G. 1953 *Lezioni di Storia del Diritto Italiano. Le Fonti. Età romano-barbarici*, (Turin).

Avagliano F. 1986 'Erchempert von Montecassino', *Lexikon des Mittelalters* vol. III, 2124-5.

Avesani R. 1976 'La cultura Veronese dal secolo IX al secolo XII', *SCultura Veneta* I, pp. 240-70.

Baesecke G. 1948 *Das lateinisch-althochdeutsch Reimgebet (Carmen ad Deum) und das Rätsel vom Vogel federlos*, (Probleme der Wissenschaft in Vergangenheit und Gegenwart 1; Berlin).

- Balzani U. 1909** *Le Cronache Italiane nel Medio Evo*, (Milan, 3rd. edition).
- Balzaretti R. 1990** *The Lands of St. Ambrogio*, (unpublished London PhD thesis).
- Belletzkie R. J. 1980** 'Pope Nicholas I and John of Ravenna: the Struggle for Ecclesiastical Rights in the Ninth Century', *Church History* 49.3, pp. 262-72.
- Bellini A. 1925** 'L'Abbazia e la Chiesa di S. Donato in Sesto Calende', *ASL* ser. 6a, LII, pp. 79-129.
- Belting H. 1962** 'Studien zum beneventanischen Hof im 8 Jahrhundert', *Dumbarton Oaks Papers* XVI, pp. 141-93.
- Benericetti R. 1994** *Il Pontificale di Ravenna: Studio Critico*, (Biblioteca Cardinale Gaetano Cicognani; Faenza).
- Bernareggi E. 1960** *Il Sistema Economico e la Monetazione dei Longobardi nell'Italia Superiore*, (Milan).
- Bernareggi E. 1971** 'Conclusioni sulle Diverse fasi della Monetazione Longobarda', *Rivista Italiana Numismatica* ser. 5a, XIX (LXXIII), pp. 135-55.
- Bernareggi E. 1976** 'Struttura Economica e Monetazione del Regno Longobardo', *Quaderni Ticinesi di Numismatica e Antichità Classiche* V, pp. 331-76.
- Bernareggi E. 1983** 'Carolingian Gold Coins from the Ilanz Hoard', *Studies in Numismatic Method presented to Philip Grierson*, eds. C. N. L. Brooke, B. H. I. H. Stewart, J.G. Pollard, T.R. Volk, (Cambridge), pp. 127-35.
- Bernt G. 1968** *Das lateinische Epigramm im Übergang von der Spätantike zum frühen Mittelalter* (Münchener Beiträge zur Mediävistik und Renaissance-Forschung 2).
- Berschin W. 1988** *Greek Letters and the Latin Middle Ages*, (Washington D. C.).
- Berschin W. 1988** *Biographie und Epochenstil im lateinischen Mittelalter*, 3 vols. (Quellen und Untersuchungen zur lateinischen Philologie des Mittelalters Bd. 9; Stuttgart).
- Bertolini M. G. 1966** 'Andrea di Bergamo', *DBI* 4, pp. 79-80.
- Bertolini O. 1965** 'Carlomagno e Benevento', ed. W. Braunsfels et al., *Karl der Große*, vol. I, pp. 609-71.
- Bertolini P. 1970** 'Bono', *DBI* 12, pp. 266-8.

Bertolini P. 1970 'La Serie Episcopale Napoletane nei secc. VIII e IX. Ricerche sulle Fonti per la Storia d'Italia Meridionale', *RSCI* 24, pp. 349-440

Bertolini P. 1978 *Figura velut qua Christus designatur. La Persistenza del simbolo della croce nell'Iconografia Numismatica durante il Periodo Iconoclasta: Costantinopoli e Benevento*, (Rome).

Berza M. 1942 'Sentiment nationale et esprit locale chez les lombards mèridionaux IX-XI siècles', *Revue Historique du Sud-est Europeen* XIX, pp. 362-70.

Besta E. 1923 *Fonti: Legislazione e Scienza Giuridica dalla Caduta dell'Impero Romano al Secolo Decimoquinto. Storia del Diritto Italiano*, vol. I i, ed. P. del Giudice, (Milan).

Betteli Bergamaschi M. 1975 'Ramperto Vescovo di Brescia (sec. IX) e la *Historia de Translatione Beati Filastrii*', *Ricerche Storiche sulla Chiesa Ambrosiana* V, pp. 48-140.

Bethmann L. 1847 'Ueber den Sprachgebrauch des *Chronicon Casinense* und des Andreas Presbyter von Bergamo', *Archiv* IX., pp. 659-72.

Bethmann L. 1849/51 'Die Geschichtschreibung der Langobarden', *Archiv* X, pp. 335-414.

Bezzola R. 1944 *Les Origines et la Formation de la Littérature Courtoise en Occident 500-1200*: vol. I *La Tradition Impériale de la Fin de l'Antiquité au XIe Siècle*, (Paris).

Bianchi D. 1937 'Da Paolo Diacono all'Anonimo Salernitano', *Memorie Storiche Forogiuliesi* XXXIII, pp. 27-64.

Bischoff B. 1968 'Frühkarolingische Handschriften und ihre Heimat', *Scriptorium* 22 pp. 306-14.

Bischoff B. 1973 *Sammelhandschrift Berlin Diezamus B. 66*, (Grammatici Latini Catalogus Librorum; Graz).

Bischoff B. 1981 'Die Hofbibliothek Karls des Grossen', *Mittelalterliche Studien. Ausgewählte Aufsätze zur Schriftkunde und Literaturgeschichte* III, (Stuttgart, 1981), pp. 149-70.

Bischoff B. 1982 'Italienische Handschriften des neunten bis zum elften Jahrhunderts in frühmittelalterlichen Bibliotheken ausserhalb Italiens', eds. C. Questa & R. Raffaelli, *Il Libro e il Testo. Atti del Convegno Internazionale* (Urbino, Sept. 1982), pp. 171-94.

Bishop E. 1904 'An Antiquary of the Ninth Century (Agnellus of Ravenna)', *Liturgica Historica*, (London) pp. 370-83; [orig. publ. *Downside Review* 1894].

- Blason Scarel S. ed. 1995** *Attila e gli Unni* (Rome).
- Blumenkranz B. 1960** *Juifs et Chrétiens dans le Monde Occidental*, (Paris).
- Blumenkranz B. 1963** *Les Auteurs Chrétiens Latins du Moyen age sur les Juifs et le Judaïsme*, (Paris).
- Bognetti G. P. 1961** 'Brescia Carolingio', *SBrescia* I, pp. 449-83.
- Böhmer Muhlbacher 1991** *Regesten* vol. III *Die Regesten des Regnum Italiae und der Burgundischer Regna Teil: die Karolinger im Regnum Italiae 840-887 (888)*, ed. H. Zielinski, (Vienna, Cologne).
- Bonacini P. 1991** 'Giustizia Pubblica e Società nell'Italia Carolingia', *Quaderni Medievali* 31-2, pp. 6-35.
- Bonini-Valetti I. 1992** 'La chiesa dalle origini agli inizi del dominio Veneziano', *DBrescia*, pp. 17-64.
- Borst A. 1958** *Der Turmbau von Babel*, vol. II, (Stuttgart).
- Boscolo A. 1964** *Le Fonti della Storia Medioevale. Orientamenti.*, (Pubblicazioni del Seminario dell'Istituto di Storia Medioevale e Moderna dell'Università di Cagliari 3 - Sassari).
- Boshof E. 1990** 'Einheitsidee und Teilungsprinzip in der Regierungszeit Ludwigs des Frommen', eds. Godman & Collins, *Charlemagne's Heir*, pp. 161-89.
- Bougard F. 1993** 'Engelberga', *DBI* vol. 42, pp. 668-76.
- Bougard F. 1995** *La Justice dans le Royaume d'Italie. De la Fin du VIIIe Siècle au Début du XIe Siècle*, (École Française de Rome, fasc. 291, Rome).
- Bourgain P. 1992** 'Les Recueils Carolingiens de Poésie Rythmique', *De Tertullien aux Mozarabes. t.2, Antiquité Tardive et Christianisme ancien (VI-IX siècle). Mélanges Offerts à Jacques Fontaine...* (Collection des Études Augustiniennes. Série Moyen-âge et Temps Moderne 26; Paris), pp. 117-27.
- Braunfels W. & Beumann H. ed. 1965-7** *Karl der Große. Lebenswerk und Nachleben*, 4 vols. (Dusseldorf).
- Brown T. S. 1984** *Gentlemen and Officers. Imperial Administration and Aristocratic Power in Byzantine Italy A.D. 554-800*, (British School at Rome).

Brown T. S. 1986 'Romanitas and Campanilismo: Agnellus of Ravenna's View of the Past', *The Inheritance of Historiography 350-900*, ed. C. Holdsworth & T. P. Wiseman (Exeter Studies in History 12), pp. 107-14.

Brown T. S. 1987 'Louis the Pious and the Papacy: a Ravenna Perspective', ed. Godman & Collins, *Charlemagne's Heir*, pp. 297-307.

Brown T. S. 1988 'The Interplay Between Roman and Byzantine Traditions and Local Sentiment in the Exarchate of Ravenna', *Bisanzio, Roma e l'Italia nell'Alto Medioevo*, (SSpol 1986, publ. 1988), pp. 127-60.

Brugnoli P. ed. 1987 *La Cattedrale di Verona*, (Venice).

Brühl C. R. 1954 'Die Kaiserpfalz bei St. Peter und die Pfalz Ottos III auf dem Palatin', *QF* 34, pp. 1-30.

Brühl C. R. 1975 *Palatium und Civitas. Bd. I. Gallien. Studien zur Profanotopographie spätantiker Civitates vom 3 bis zum 13 Jahrhundert*, (Vienna, Cologne).

Brunelli R. 1986 *Diocesi di Mantova* (Storia Religiosa della Lombardia 8, eds. A. Caprioli, A. Rimoldi, L. Vaccaro).

Brunner K. 1979 *Oppositionelle Gruppen im Karolingerreich*, (Veröffentlichungen des Instituts für Österreichische Geschichtsforschung Band XXV).

Bullough D. A. 1962 'Baiuli in the Carolingian *regnum langobardorum* and the Career of Abbot Waldo', *English Historical Review* CCCV (1962), pp. 625-37.

Bullough D. A. 1966 'Urban Change in Early Medieval Italy: the Example of Pavia', *PBSR* n.s. XXI, XXXIV (1966), pp. 83-129.

Bullough D. A. 1968 *Italy and Her Invaders*, (Inaugural Lecture, Univ. of Nottingham, Feb. 2, 1968).

Bullough D. A. 1980 *The Age of Charlemagne*, (London 2nd edn.).

Bullough D. A. 1986 'Ethnic History and the Carolingians: an Alternative Reading of Paul the Deacon's *Historia Langobardorum*', eds. Holdsworth & Wiseman, *Inheritance of Historiography*, pp. 85-101 [repr. *Carolingian Renewal*].

Bullough D. A. 1991 *Carolingian Renewal: Sources and Heritage* (Manchester University Press).

Bullough D. A. 1991 'Aula Renovata: the Court Before the Aachen Palace', *Carolingian Renewal*, pp. 267-301; [orig. publ. as Raleigh Lecture on History 1985 in *Proceedings of the British Academy*.]

Bullough D. A. 1991 'Imagines Regum and their Significance in the Early Medieval West', *Carolingian Renewal*, pp. 39-70.

Buttrey T. V. 1994 'Calculating Ancient Die Production II: Why It Cannot Be Done', *Numismatic Chronicle* 154, pp. 335-52.

Calasso F. 1954 *Medio Evo del Diritto* vol. I. *Le Fonti*, (Milan).

Calderini C. 1975 'Il Palazzo di Liutprando a Corteolona', *Contributi dell'Istituto di Archeologia. Università dello Sacro Cuore*, 5, pp. 174-208.

Capitani O. 1973 'Agnello Ravennate nella Recente Storia della Storiografia Medioevale', *Felix Ravenna* 105, pp. 183-98.

Capitani O. 1979 'La storiografia altomedievale: linee di emergenza dalla critica contemporanea', *Annali dell'Istituto Storico italo-germanico, Trento*, V, pp. 209-34.

Capo L. 1996 'La Polemica Longobarda sulla Caduta del Regno', *RSI* CVIII, pp. 5-35.

Carile A. 1992, 'Agnello Storico', *SRavenna* II.2, pp. 373-8.

Cassandro G. 1968 'Il ducato Bizantino', *SNapoli*, I.i, pp.1-408.

Cau E. 1971 'Scrittura e Cultura a Novara, sec. VIII-X', *Ricerche Medievali* 6-9 (1971-3), pp.1-74.

Cavanna A. 1978 'La Civiltà Giuridica Longobarda', *I Longobardi e la Lombardia. Saggi*, (Milan), pp. 1-35.

Chailley J. 1960 *L'École Musicale de St. Martial de Limoges jusqu'à la Fin du XIe Siècle*, (Paris).

Cilento N. 1956 'Di Marino Freccia Erudito Napoletano del Cinquecento e di alcuni Codici di Cronache Medievali a lui Noti', *BISI* 68, pp. 281-310 [repr. in Cilento 1966, pp. 73-102, as 'La Tradizione Manoscritta di Erchemperto e del Chronicon Salernitanum'].

Cilento N. 1957 'La Cronaca dei Conti e dei Principi Longobardi di Capua dei Codici Cassinese 175 e Cavense 4 (815-1000)', *BISI* 69, pp. 1-66 [repr. in Cilento 1966, pp. 103-74].

Cilento N. 1961 'La Struttura del racconto nelle cronache Benedittino-Cassinesi della Langobardi Meridionale nei secc. IX-X', *BISI* 73, pp. 85-112 [repr. in Cilento 1966, pp. 40-64 as 'I Cronisti della Langobardia Minore'].

Cilento N. 1966 *Italia Meridionale Longobarda*, (Milan, Naples).

Cilento N. 1969 'Civiltà Napoletana del Medio Evo nei secoli VI-XIII', *SNapoli* II.2, pp. 521-711.

Colorni V. 1980 'Gli Ebrei nell'alto Medioevo', *Gli Ebrei nell'Alto Medioevo* (SSpol XXVI, 1978, publ. 1980), pp. 241-304.

Coniglio G. 1958 *Mantova: la Storia*, (Mantua).

Corpus Nummorum Italicorum. 1912 - *Primo Tentativo di un Catalogo Generale delle monete Medievali e Moderne Coniate in Italia o da Italiani in Altri Paesi*. (Milan).

Cortesi G. 1981 'Andrea Agnello e il «Liber Pontificalis Ecclesiae Ravennatis»', *Corso di Cultura sull'Arte Ravennate e Bizantina* XXVIII, pp. 31-76.

Crosara F. 1952 'Rex Langobardia - Rex Italiae: Note in Margine alla 'Historia' di Andrea di Bergamo', *Atti del 2o Congresso di Studi Sull'Alto Medioevo*, pp. 152-88.

Day W. R. 1997 'The monetary Reform of Charlemagne and the Circulation of Money in Early Medieval Campania', *Early Medieval Europe* 6.1, pp. 25-45.

De Clerq C. 1931 'Capitulaires Francs en Italie à l'Époque de Charlemagne', *Hommage à Dom Ursmer Berlière*, (Recueil publié...par l'Institut Belge de Rome...; Brussels, 1931), pp. 251-60.

Deliyanis Mauskopf D. 1996 'Agnellus of Ravenna and Iconoclasm: Theology and Politics in a Ninth-Century Historical Text', *Speculum* 71.3, pp. 559-76.

Delogu P. 1964 '«Consors Regni»: un Problema Carolingia', *BISI* 76, pp. 47-99.

Delogu P. 1967 'L'Istituzione Comitale nell'Italia Carolingia (Ricerche sull'aristocrazia Carolingia in Italia)', *BISI* 79, pp. 53-114.

Delogu P. 1968 'Strutture Politiche e Ideologia nel Regno di Lodovico II', *BISI* 80, pp. 137-89.

Delogu P. 1977 *Mito di una Città Meridionale (Salerno sec. VIII-XI)*, (Naples).

Delogu P. 1996 'La Giustizia nell'Italia Meridionale', *La Giustizia nell'Alto Medioevo secoli IX-XI*, (SSpol XLIV), pp. 257-308.

De Nicola A. 1979 'I Versi sulla Distruzione di Aquileia', *Studi Goriziani* 4, pp.1-31.

Depreux P. 1992 'Das Königtum Bernhards von Italien und sein Verhältnis zum Kaisertum', *QF* 72, pp. 1-25.

De Vergottini G. 1979 'Venezia e l'Istria nell'Alto Medioevo', *SCiviltà Veneziana* I, pp. 71-83.

Devisse J. 1975 *Hincmar Archevêque de Reims*, (Geneva).

Devos P. 1958 'L'oeuvre de Guarimpotus, Hagiographe Napolitain', *Analecta Bollandiana* 76, pp. 151-87.

Diocesi di Brescia 1992 (Storia Religiosa della Lombardia 3, eds. A. Caprioli, A. Rimoldi, L. Vaccaro; Varese).

Diocesi di Mantova, see Brunelli.

Diocesi di Milano 1990 (Storia Religiosa della Lombardia 9-10, eds. A. Caprioli, A. Rimoldi, L. Vaccaro).

Dolley R. H. & Morrison K. F. 1966 *The Carolingian Coins in the British Museum*, (London).

Doyle E. G. 1983 *Sedulius Scottus On Christian Rulers and The Poems*, (Medieval and Renaissance Texts and Studies vol 17; New York).

Düchting R. 1968 *Sedulius Scottus. Seine Dichtungen*, (Munich).

Eastwood B. S. 1994 'The Astronomy of Macrobius in Carolingian Europe: Dungal's Letter of 811 to Charles the Great', *Early Medieval Europe* 3, 2, pp. 117-34.

Ebenbauer E. 1978 *Carmen Historicum. Untersuchungen zur historischen Dichtung in Karolingischen Europa*, 2 vols. (Philologia Germanica).

Ebenbauer E. 1985 *Gründriss der Romanischen Literaturen des Mittelalters*, (La Littérature Historiographique des Origines à 1500; Heidelberg).

Ebert F. *Allgemeine Geschichte der Literatur des Mittelalters im Abendlande*, (Leipzig).

Eickhoff E. 1966 *Seekrieg und Seepolitik zwischen Islam und Abendland*, (Berlin).

Eiten G. 1912 *Das Unterkönigtum im Reiche der Merowinger und der Karolinger*, (Heidelberg).

- Ercolani Cocchi E. 1984** *Imperi Romano e Bizantino, Regni Barbarici in Italia attraverso le monete del Museo Nazionale di Ravenna*, (Bologna).
- Fasoli G. 1965** 'Carlo Magno nelle Tradizioni Storico-Leggendarie Italiane', ed. W. Braunfels, *Karl der Grosse*, vol. IV, pp. 348-63. ()
- Fasoli G. 1969** 'Rileggendo il 'Liber Pontificalis' di Agnello Ravennate', *La Storiografia Altomedievale* (SSpol 1969 - publ. 1970), pp. 457-95; [repr. in *Scritti di Storia Medievale* (Bologna 1974), pp. 105-36].
- Fasoli G. 1974** 'La Coscienza Civica nelle «Laudes Civitatum»', *Scritti di Storia Medievale* eds. F. Bocchi, A. Carile, A. I. Pini, (Bologna), pp. 293-318.
- Ferrari M. 1972** 'In Papia Convenient ad Dungalum', *IMU XV*, pp. 1-52.
- Fichtenau H. 1991** *The Carolingian Empire*, trans. P. Munz, (Toronto Academy Reprints) [first published as *Das karolingische Imperium*, 1957].
- Ficker J. 1868** *Forschungen zur Reichs- und Rechtsgeschichte Italiens*, (Innsbruck 1868-74, 4 vols.).
- Fischer J. 1965** *Königtum, Adel und Kirche im Königreich Italiens 774-875*, (Habelts Dissertationsdrucke Reihe Mittelalterliche Geschichte, Hft. 1; Bonn).
- Fleckenstein J. 1958** *Die Hofkapelle der deutschen Könige*, (Schriften der MGH 16/1; Stuttgart).
- Fourmy M. H & Leroy M. 1934** 'La Vie de S. Philarète', *Byzantion* 9, pp. 85-167.
- Fuiano M. 1961** *La Cultura a Napoli nell'alto Medioevo*, (Naples).
- Ganshof F. L. 1958** *Recherches sur les Capitulaires*, (Paris).
- Gasparri S. 1990** 'Il Regno e la Legge dei Longobardi, Romani e Franchi nello Sviluppo dell'Ordinamento Pubblico (secoli VI-X)', *La Cultura. Rivista di Filosofia, Letteratura e Storia XXVIII.1*, pp. 243-66.
- Gasparri S. & Cammorasano P. eds. 1990** *Langobardia* (Udine)
- Gaudenzi A. 1916** 'Il Monastero di Nonantola, il Ducato di Persiceta e la Chiesa di Bologna', *BISI* 36, pp. 7-312; Appendices in *BISI* 37, pp. 313-570.
- Gavinelli S. 1983** 'Per un'Enciclopedia Carolingia (Codice Bergense 363)', *IMU XXVI*, pp. 1-26.

- Gay J. 1960** *L'Italie Meridionale et l'Empire Byzantin*, (New York).
- Geary P. J. 1990** *Furta Sacra. Thefts of Relics in the Central Middle Ages*, (2nd edn., Princeton).
- Geary P. J. 1994** *Phantoms of Remembrance. Memory and Oblivion at the End of the First Millenium*, (Princeton)
- Gherardi L. 1959** 'Il Codice Angelica 123, Monumento della chiesa Bolognese nel. Sec. XI', *Quadrivium* III, pp. 1-110.
- Godman P. 1985** *Poetry of the Carolingian Renaissance* (London).
- Godman P. 1985** 'Louis the Pious and His Poets', *FS* 19, pp. 239-89.
- Godman P. 1987** *Poets and Emperors: Frankish Politics and Carolingian Poetry* (Oxford).
- Godman P. & Collins R. eds. 1990** *Charlemagne's Heir: New Perspectives on the Reign of Louis the Pious*, (Oxford).
- Goffart W. 1988** *The Narrators of Barbarian History*, (Princeton).
- Gonin H. L. 1933** *Excerpta Agnelliana: the Ravennate Liber Pontificalis as a Source for the History of Art*, (Utrecht).
- Gorini G. 1992** 'La Zecca di Ravenna', *SRavenna* II, 2, pp. 209-38.
- Gray N. 1948** *The Palaography of Latin Inscriptions in the Eighth, Ninth and Tenth Centuries in Italy*, (British School at Rome).
- Grierson P. 1967** 'The Volume of Anglo-Saxon Coinage', *Economic History Review* XX, pp. 153-60.
- Grierson P. 1969** review of Morrison & Grunthal 1967, *Numismatic Chronicle* 7th series, vol. IX, pp. 346-50.
- Grierson P. 1973** *Catalogue of the Byzantine Coins in the Dumbarton Oaks Collection and in the Whittemore Collection*, vol. III with A. R. Bellinger, (Dumbarton Oaks).
- Grierson P. 1976** 'Symbolism in Early Medieval Charters and Coins', *Simboli e Simbologia nell'Alto Medioevo*, (*SSpol* XXIII), pp. 601-30; discussion 631-40.
- Grierson P. 1979** *Dark Age Numismatics*, (Variorum London).

Grierson P. 1982 *Byzantine Coins*, (London, Los Angeles).

Grierson P. & Blackburn M. 1986 *Medieval European Coinage*, vol. I *The Early Middle Ages*, (Cambridge).

Gualazzini U. 1961 'Aspetti Giuridici dei Problemi Monetari in Italia durante l'Alto Medioevo', *Moneta e Scambi nell'Alto Medioevo*, (SSpol 8, 1960; publ. 1961), pp. 89-122.

Guerrini P. 1938 'Nella Luce di 4 Centenari,' *Memorie Storiche della Diocesi di Brescia* ser. 9a, (Monografie di Storia Bresciana XV [n.b. frontispiece gives vol. XIII], pp. 151-244.

Guidaldi P. L. 1958 'I piu Antichi Codici della Biblioteca Antoniana di Padova (codici del sec. IX)', *Il Santo* 2, fasc. 4, pp. 315-33.

Haertle C. M. 1996 'Anmerkungen zum Karolingische Münzmonogramm des 9 Jahrhundert', ed. P. Rück, *Graphische Symbole in mittelalterlichen Urkunden. Beiträge zur diplomatischen Semiotik*, (Historische Hilfswissenschaften Bd. 3 - Sigmaringen), pp. 263-91.

Halphen L. 1977 *Charlemagne and the Carolingian Empire*, (trans. G. De Nie - Amsterdam, New York, Oxford).

Hannig J. 1982 *Consensus Fidelium: Frühfeudale Interpretationen des Verhältnisses von Königtum und Adel am Beispiel des Frankenreiches*, (Monographien zur Geschichte des Mittelalters 27; Stuttgart).

Harrison D. 1994 *The Early Medieval State and the Towns*, (Lund).

Hartmann L. 1900-23 *Geschichte Italiens im Mittelalter*, 4 vols. (Gotha).

Heffernan T. J. 1988 *Sacred Biography. Saints and their Biographers in the Middle Ages*, (Oxford).

Heitz C. 1963 *Recherches sur les Rapports entre Architecture et Liturgie à l'Époque Carolingienne*, (Paris).

Hendy M. F. 1985 *Studies in the Byzantine Monetary Economy c. 300-1450*, (Cambridge).

Herrin J. 1987 *The Formation of Christendom*, (London).

Hlawitschka E. 1960 *Franken, Alemannen, Bayern und Burgunder im Oberitalien (774-962)*, (Forschungen zur Oberrheinischen Landesgeschichte Bd. VIII; Freiburg).

Hlawitschka E. 1983 'Die politischen Intentionen der Widonen im Dukat von Spoleto', *Atti del 9° Congresso Internazionale di Studi sull'Alto Medioevo*, (Spoleto), pp. 123-47.

Hlawitschka E. 1983 'Die Widonen im Dukat von Spoleto', *QF* 63, pp. 20-92.

Hoffmann H. 1991 *Buchkunst und Königtum im Ottonischen und frühsalischen Reich*, (MGH Schriften 30/1; Stuttgart).

Hofmeister A. 1906 *Markgrafen und Markgrafschaften im italischen Königreich*, (MIÖG Egzbd VII).

Holdsworth C. & Wiseman T. P eds. 1986 *The Inheritance of Historiography 350-900*, (Exeter Studies in History 12).

Holum K. G. 1982 *Theodosian Empresses: Women and Imperial Dominion in Late Antiquity*, (Berkely, Los Angeles, London).

Hyde J. K. 1966 'Medieval Descriptions of Cities', *Bulletin of the John Rylands Library* 48, pp. 308-40.

Jarnut J. 1980 *Bergamo 568-1098. Verfassungs-, sozial- und wirtschaftsgeschichte eine lombardischer Stadt im Mittelalter*, (Wiesbaden).

Jarnut J. 1989 'Ludwig der Fromme, Lothar und das Regnum Italiae', ed. Godman & Collins, *Charlemagne's Heir*, pp. 349-62.

Jarnut J. 1989 'Kaiser Ludwig der Fromme und König Bernhard von Italien. Der Versuch einer Rehabilitierung', *Studi Medievali*, XXX.2, pp. 636-48.

Jarnut J. 1990 'I Longobardi nell'Epoca Precedente all'Occupazione dell'Italia', eds. Gasparri & Cammorasano, *Langobardia*, pp. 3-35.

Kantorowicz E. 1946 *Laudes Regiae: a Study in Liturgical Acclamations and Medieval Ruler Worship*, (University of California Publications in History XXXIII).

Kasten B. 1986 *Adalhard von Corbie. Die Biographie eines Karolingischen Politikers- und Klostervorstehers*, (Studia Humaniora Bd. 3).

Kiersnowska T. 1961 'Monnaies Carolingiennes sur les Terres Slaves', *Wiadomosci Numizmatyczne (Polish Numismatic News)* V, pp. 90-99.

Klewitz W. 1936 'Petrus Diaconus und die Montecassinenser Klosterchronik des Leo von Ostia', *Archiv für Urkundenforschung* 14, pp. 414-53.

Koehler W. R. W. & Mütherich F. eds. 1971 *Die Karolingischen Miniaturen* vol. IV: *Die Hofschule Kaiser Lothars*, (Deutsche Verein für Kunstwissenschaft - Berlin).

Konecny S. 1976 *Die Frauen des Karolingischen Königshauses. Die politische Bedeutung der Ehe und die Stellung der frau in der fränkischen Herrscherfamilie vom 7 bis zum 10 Jahrhundert*, (Vienna).

Körner Th. 1986 'Andreas von Bergamo', *Reallexikon des Mittelalters*, vol. I, 603.

Krahwinkler H. 1992 *Friaul im Frühmittelalter. Geschichte einer Region vom Ende des fünften bis zum Ende des zehnte Jahrhunderts*, (Veröffentlichungen des Instituts für Österreichische Geschichtsforschung XXX; Vienna, Cologne).

Kretschmayr H. 1905 *Geschichte von Venedig*, (Gotha).

Kreutz B. M. 1991 *Before the Normans: Southern Italy in the Ninth and Tenth Centuries*, (Pennsylvania).

Lafaurie J. 1972 'Le Trésor Carolingien de Sarzana-Luni', *Monnaies et Médailles racontent l'Histoire de la France*, (Paris), pp. 23-38.

Lamma P. 1961 'Agnello da Ravenna', *DBI* 1, pp. 429-30.

Lange H. 1993 'Die Anfänge der modernen Rechtswissenschaft. Bologna und das frühe Mittelalter', *Akademie der Wissenschaften und der Literatur. (Mainz). Abhandlungen der geistes- und sozialwissenschaftlichen Klasse* 9, pp. 1-57.

Lanzoni G. 1909 'Il Liber Pontificalis Ravennate', *Rivista di Scienze Storiche* (anno VI, fasc. IV, V), pp. 345-70, 425-64, 571-92.

Lapidge M. 1977 'The Authorship of the Adonic Verses 'ad Fidolium' Attributed to Columbanus', *SM XVIII*, II, pp. 249-314.

Lauer E. ed. 1939 *Catalogue Général de Manuscrits Latins*, vol. I, (Paris).

Lauer Ph. 1899 'Le Poème de la Destruction de Rome et les Origines de la Cité Leonine', *Mélanges d'Archeologie et d'Histoire. École Française de Rome XIX*, pp. 307-61.

Lazard S. 1976 'De l'Origine des hellénismes d'Agnello', *Revue de linguistique romane*, 40, pp. 255-98.

- Leicht P. S.** 1943 'Dal "regnum langobardorum" al "regnum italiae"', in *Scritti Vari* (Milan), pp. 221-35; [orig. publ. *Rivista di Storia del Diritto Italiano* III (1930), pp. 3-20].
- Lentini A.** 1988 *Medioevo Letterario Cassinese: Scritti Vari*, ed. F. Avagliano, (Miscellanea Cassinense 57; Montecassino).
- Leporace T.** 1936 'L'Imperatrice Ageltrude', *Samnium* 9, fasc. 1-2, pp. 1-45, fasc. 3-4, pp. 142-76.
- Llewellyn P.** 1993 *Rome in the Dark Ages*, (London, 2nd edn.).
- Lockwood P. E.** 1992 *Lupus of Ferrières*, (unpublished London PhD Thesis).
- Lo Monaco F.** 1981 'Aganone di Bergamo e la Lombardia Lotaringia', *Archivio Storico Bergamasco* 1, pp. 9-23.
- I Longobardi** 1992 ed. G. C. Menis (Milan) [Catalogue of a 1990 Milan exhibition].
- Lopez R. S.** 1961 'Moneta e Monetieri nell'Italia Barbarica', *Moneta e Scambi nell'Alto Medioevo*, (SSpol 1960, publ. 1961), pp. 57-88.
- Löwe H.** 1952 'Von Theoderich dem Großen zu Karl dem Großen. Das Werden des Abendlandes im Geschichtsbild des frühen Mittelalters', *DA* 9, pp. 353-401.
- Löwe H.** 1958 'Von den Grenzen des Kaisergedankens in der Karolingerzeit', *DA* 14, pp.
- Löwe H.** 1972 'Hinkmar von Reims und der Apocrisiar', *Festschrift H. Heimpel*, vol. III, (Göttingen), pp. 197-225.
- Löwe H.** 1981 'Columbanus und Fidolius', *DA* 37, pp. 1-19.
- Luzatti Laganà F.** 1983 'Il Ducato di Napoli', *Il Mezzogiorno dai Bizantini a Federico II*, (Turin, 1983), pp.
- Lynch J. H.** 1986 *Godparents and Kinship in Early Medieval Europe*, (Princeton).
- Malfatti B.** 1876 *Bernardo, Re d'Italia* (Florence).
- Mallardo D.** 1943 *Storia Antica della Chiesa di Napoli*, (Naples).
- Mallardo D.** 1950 'Giovanni Diacono Napoletano: la Continuazione del «Liber Pontificalis»', *RSCI* 4, pp. 325-58.

Manacorda F. 1968 *Ricerche sugli Inizi della Dominazione dei Carolingi in Italia*, (Istituto Storico Italiano per il Medio Evo, fasc. 71-2 - Rome).

Marchi G. P. 1993 'Il «Versus de Nativitate» dal Codice XC della Biblioteca Capitolare di Verona', *Medioevo e Latinità in Memoria di Ezio Franceschini*, eds. A. Ambrosioni, M. Ferrari, C. Leonardi, G. Picasso, M. Regoliosi, P. Zerbi, (Università del Sacro Cuore, Milan).

Martin C. 1966 'Un Ripostiglio di Monete Italiane del IX Secolo', *Atti del 1° Convegno Internazionale di studi sull'alto Medioevo*, (1963 - publ. 1966, Novara), pp. 87-91.

Martin J-M. 1980 'Éléments Préféodaux dans les Principautés de Bénévent et de Capoue (fin du VIIIe siècle, début du XIe siècle): Modalités de Privatisation du Pouvoir', *Structures Feodales et Féodalisme dans l'Occident Méditerranéen (Xe-XIIIe s.)*, (Colloques Internationaux du Centre de la Recherche Scientifique no. 588 - Paris), pp. 553-81.

Martin J-M. 1993 *La Pouille du VIe au XIIe siècles*, (Collection de l'École Française de Rome - 179).

Martinez Pizarro J. 1989 *A Rhetoric of the Secene: Dramatic Narrative in the Early Middle Ages*, (Toronto).

Martinez Pizarro J. 1995 *Writing Ravenna. The Liber Pontificalis of Andreas Agnellus* (Michigan).

McCarthy D. & O'Croinin D. 1987, 'The Lost Irish Easter Table Rediscovered', *Peritia* 6-7, pp. 227-42.

McCormick M. 1984 'The Liturgy of War in the Early Middle Ages and the Carolingian Monarchy', *Viator*, pp. 1-23.

McCormick M. 1986 *Eternal Victory: Triumphal Rulership in Late Antiquity, Byzantium and the Early Medieval West*, (Cambridge).

McCormick M. 1994 'Texte, Images et Iconoclasme dans le Cadre des Relations entre Byzance et l'Occident Carolingien', *Testo e Immagine nell'Alto Medioevo (SSpol XLI, 1993; publ. 1994)*, pp. 95-158.

McKitterick R. 1980 'Some Carolingian Law-books and their Function', *Authority and Power - Studies on Medieval Law and Government Presented to W. Ullmann*, eds. P. Linehan & B. Tierney (Cambridge), pp. 13-28.

McKitterick R. 1987 *The Carolingians and the Written Word*, (Cambridge).

- McKitterick R. ed. 1990** *The Uses of Literacy in Early Mediaeval Europe*, (Cambridge).
- McKitterick R. 1992** 'Royal Patronage of Culture in the Frankish Kingdoms under the Carolingians: Motives and Consequences', *Committenti e Produzione Artistico-Letteraria nell'alto Medioevo Occidentale* (SSpol 39, 1991 - publ. 1992), tom. 1, pp. 92-129, discussion pp. 131-5.
- McKitterick R. ed. 1994** *Carolingian Culture: Emulation and Innovation*, (Cambridge).
- Meersseman G. G., Deshusses J., Adda, eds. 1974** *l'Orazionale dell'Arcidiacono Pacifico di Verona e il Carpsum del Cantore Stefano*, (Spicilegium Friburgensis).
- Meersseman G. G. 1975** 'Il Codice XC della Biblioteca Capitolare di Verona', *Archivio Veneto*, ser. 5a, vol. CIV, pp. 11-44.
- Menant F. 1993** *Campagnes Lombardes du Moyen age: l'Economie et la Société Rurales dans la Region de Bergame, de Crémone et de Brescia du Xe au XIIIe siècle*, (Ecole Française de Rome).
- Mercati G. 1895** 'Il Catalogo Leonense dei Re Longobardi e Franchi', *Römische Quartelschrift*, pp. 337-49.
- Merkel P. J. 1850** *Die Geschichte der Langobardenrechts. Eine Abhandlung*, (Berlin).
- Metcalf D. 1965** 'How Large was the Anglo-Saxon Coinage?', *Economic History Review* XVIII, pp. 475-82.
- Meyvaert P. 1959** 'Erchempert Moine du Mont Cassin', *Révue Benedictine* 69, pp. 101-5.
- Millar M. 1993** *The Formation of a Medieval Church. Ecclesiastical Change in Verona 950-1150*, (Cornell).
- Mitchell J. 1994** 'The Display of Script and the Uses of Painting in Longobard Italy', *Testo e Immagine nell'Alto Medioevo*, t. 2 (SSpol 41, 1993; publ. 1994), pp. 887-951; discussion 953-4.
- Moorhead J. 1983** 'The West and the Roman Past: from Theoderic to Charlemagne', eds. B. Croke & A. M. Emmet, *History and Historians in Late Antiquity*, (Sydney, New York), pp.
- Mor C. G. 1952** 'La Storiografia Italiana del IX sec. da Andrea di Bergamo ad Erchemperto', *Atti del 2° Congresso di Studi sull'Alto Medioevo*, (Spoleto), pp. 241-7.
- Mor C. G. 1976** 'La Cultura Aquileiese nei Secoli IX-XI', *SCultura Veneta* I, pp. 287-311.

Mor C. G. 1991 'Modificazioni Strutturali dell'Assemblea Nazionale Longobarda nel secolo VIII', *Italia Longobarda*, ed. G. C. Menis, (Venice), pp. 88-94 [also in Mor's *Scritti di storia Giuridica Altomedievale*, (Pisa, 1977), pp. 525-34.]

Mordek H. 1984 'Karolingische Kapitularien', *Überlieferung und Geltung normativer texte des frühen und hohen Mittelalters. Vier Vorträge, gehalten aus dem 35 Deutschen Historikertag 1984 in Berlin*, ed. H. Mordek, (Sigmaringen 1986 - Quellen und Forschungen zum Recht im Mittelalter, 4) pp. 25-50.

Mordek H. 1994 'Ein Bildnis König Bernhards von Italien ? Zum Frontispiz in Cod. St. Paul (Kärnten) Stiftsbibliothek 4/1', *Società, Istituzioni, Spiritualità. Studi in Onore di Cinzio Violante*, (Spoleto), t. 2, pp. 547-55.

Mordek H. 1995 'Frühmittelalterliche Gesetzgeber und Iustitia in Miniaturen weltlicher Rechtshandschriften', *La Giustizia nell'Alto Medioevo (secoli V-VIII)*, (SSpol 42 - 1994; publ. 1995), pp. 997-1052.

Mordek H. 1995 *Bibliotheca Capitularium regum Francorum manuscripta. Überlieferung und Traditionszusammenhang der fränkischen Herrschererlasse*, (MGH Hilfsmittel 15; Munich).

Morin D. G. 1902 'La Translation de St. Benoit et la Chronique de Leno', *Revue Benedictine* 19, pp. 337-56.

Morrison K. F. 1964 *The Two Kingdoms. Ecclesiology in Carolingian Political Thought*, (Princeton).

Morrison K. F. & Grunthal H. 1967 *Carolingian Coinage*, (Numismatic Notes and Monographs, American Numismatic Society, no. 158).

Moschetti G. 1954 *Primordi Esetici sulla Legislazione Longobarda nel sec. IX a Verona*, (Spoleto).

Nauerth C. 1974 *Agnellus von Ravenna. Untersuchungen zur archäologischen Methode des ravenatischen Chronisten*, (Münchener Beiträge zur Mediävistik und Renaissance Forschung 15).

Nelson J. L. 1983 'Legislation and Consensus in the reign of Charles the Bald', *Ideal and Reality. Studies in Frankish and Anglo-Saxon Society presented to J. M. Wallace-Hadrill*, (Oxford), pp. 202-27.

Nelson J. L. 1985 'Public Histories and private history in the work of Nithard', *Speculum* 60, pp. 251-93.

- Nelson J. L.** 1990 'The Last Years of Louis the Pious', Godman & Collins eds. 1990, pp. 147-60.
- Nelson J. L.** 1990 'Literacy in Carolingian Government', McKitterick 1990, pp. 258-98.
- Nelson J. L.** 1991 *The Annals of St. Bertin*, (Manchester).
- Nelson J. L.** 1991 'La Famille de Charlemagne', *Byzantion LXI. Le Souverain à Byzance et en Occident du VIIIe au Xe siècle. Hommage à la Mémoire de Maurice Leroy*, eds. A. Dierkens & J. M. Sansterre, pp. 194-212.
- Nelson J. L.** 1992 *Charles the Bald*, (London).
- Nelson J. L.** 1996 'Translating Images of Authority: the Christian Roman Emperors in the Carolingian World', *The Frankish World 750-900*, (London), pp. 89-98.
- Noble T. F. X.** 1974 'The Revolt of King Bernard of Italy in 817: its Causes and Consequences', *Studi Medievali XV*, pp. 315-26.
- Noble T. F. X.** 1976 'The Monastic Ideal as a Model for Empire: the Case of Louis the Pious', *Revue Bénédictine* 86, pp. 235-50.
- Noble T. F. X.** 1980 'Louis the Pious and his Piety Re-reconsidered', *Revue Belge* 58, pp. 297-316.
- Noble T. F. X.** 1984 *The Republic of St. Peter. The Birth of the Papal State 680-825*, (Pennsylvania).
- Norberg D.** 1954 *La Poésie Latine Rhythmique du Haut Moyen Age*, (Studia Latina Holmiensia II).
- Norberg D.** 1979 *L'Oeuvre Poétique de Paulin d'Aquilée*.
- Norberg D.** 1985 *L'Accentuation des Mots dans le Vers Latin du Moyen Age*, (Filologiskt Arkiv 32 - Stockholm).
- Oakeshott W.** 1967 *The Mosaics of Rome from the Fourth to the Thirteenth Centuries*, (London).
- Oddy W. A.** 1974 'The Gold Coinage of Beneventum', *Numismatic Chronicle* 14, pp. 78-109.
- Ohnsorge W.** 1959 'L'Idea d'Imperio nel Secolo Nono e l'Italia Meridionale', *Atti del 3° Congresso Internazionale di Studi sull'Alto Medioevo*, (Spoleto, 1956 - publ. 1959), pp. 255-72.

- Oldoni M. 1970** 'Ilderico di Benevento', *Studi Medievali* 3 ser., XI.2, pp. 885-912.
- Oldoni M. 1972** *Anonimo Salernitano del X Secolo* (Esperienze 14 - Naples).
- Oldoni M. 1993** 'Erchemperto', *DBI* 43, pp. 66-71.
- Opfermann B. 1953** *Die Liturgischen Herrscherakklamationen im Sacrum Imperium des Mittelalters*, (Weimar).
- Orselli A. M. 1981** 'Vita Religiosa nella Città Medievale Italiana tra Dimensione Ecclesiastica e 'Cristianesimo' Civica. Una Esemplificazione', *Annali dell'Istituto Italo-Germanico in Trento* VII, pp. 361-98.
- Ortalli G. 1992** 'Il ducato e la «civitas Rivoalti»: tra Carolingi, Bizantini e Sassoni', *SVenezia* I, pp. 725-90.
- Pagnin B. 1958** 'La Provenienza del Codice Antoniano 27 e del Chronicon Regum Langobardorum in esso Contenuto', *Miscellanea in Onore di R. Cessi*, (Rome), vol. I, pp. 29-41.
- Papadopoli N. 1893** *Le Monete di Venezia*, (Venice).
- Patetta F. 1890/1** 'Sull'Introduzione in Italia della Collezione di Ansegiso, e sulla data del così detto «Capitulare Mantuanum Duplex» attribuito all 787', *Atti della Reale Accademia delle Scienze di Torino* 25, pp. 876-85.
- Patini F. 1969** 'I Luoghi di Sepoltura dei Vescovi Ravennati nel 'Liber Pontificalis' di Andrea Agnello', *Felix Ravenna* 98, fasc. 47, pp.
- Penco G. 1958** 'Tradizione Mediolatina e Fonti delle Romanze nel «Chronicon Novaliciense»', *Benedictina* 12, pp. 1-14.
- Pertile A. 1896** *Storia del Diritto Italiano dalla Caduta dell'Impero Romano alla Codificazione*, vol. I, (Turin).
- Petrucci A. 1995** 'Literacy and Graphic Culture of Early Medieval Scribes', *Writers and Readers in Medieval Italy*, trans. C. Radding, (Yale).
- Petrucci A. 1995** 'Symbolic Aspects of Written Evidence', *Writers and Readers in Medieval Italy*, trans. C. Radding, (Yale), pp. 103-31.
- Pflugk-Harttung J. v. 1903** 'Ueber Münzen und Siegel der älteren Päpste', *QF* 5, pp. 1-18.

Pflugk-Harttung J. v. 1904 'Das Hoheitsrecht über Rom auf Münzen und Urkunden bis zur Mitte des 11 Jahrhunderts', *Historisches Jahrbuch* 25, pp. 34-61, 465-84.

Picard J. C. 1981 'Conscience Urbaine et Culte des Saints: De Milan sous Liutprand à Vérone sous Pepin Ier d'Italie', *Hagiographie, Culture et Sociétés*, (Centre de Recherche sur l'Antiquité Tardive et le Haut Moyen Age; Paris), pp. 451-9.

Picard J. C. 1988 *Le Souvenir des Éveques. Sepultures, Listes Épiscopales et Culte des Éveques en Italie du Nord des Origines au Xe siècle*, (École Française de Rome, 268; Rome).

Piccinini P. 1992 'Immagini d'autorità a Ravenna', *SRavenna* II.2, pp. 31-78.

Pierpaolo M. 1990 *Storia di Ravenna. Dalle Origini all'Anno Mille*, (Ravenna).

Pochettino G. 1927 'I Pippinidi in Italia', *ASL*, LIV, pp. 1-42.

Pochettino G. 1930 *I Langobardi nell'Italia Meridionale (570-1080)*, (Milan).

Pohl W. 1988 *Die Awaren. Ein Steppenvolk in Mitteleuropa 567-822* (Munich).

Polara G. 1987 *La Letteratura Latina Tardoantica e Altomedievale*, (Rome).

Pöllnitz-Kehr G. F. von 1940 'Kaiserin Angilberga. Ein Exkurs zur Diplomatie Kaiser Ludwigs II von Italien', *Historisches Jahrbuch* 60, pp. 429-40.

Pratesi A. 1987 'La «Chronica Sancti Benedicti Casinensis»', *Montecassino dalla Prima alla Seconda Distruzione. Momenti e Aspetti della Storia Casinese (secc. VI-IX)*, (Miscellanea Cassinese 55), pp. 331-45.

Promis D. 1858 *Monete dei Romani Pontefici Avanti il Mille*, (Turin).

Piccinini P. 1992 'Immagini d'Autorità a Ravenna', *SRavenna* II, pp. 31-78.

Rabe S. 1995 *Faith, Art and Politics at Saint-Riquier. The Symbolic Vision of Angilbert*, (Philadelphia).

Radding C. 1988 *The Origins of Medieval Jurisprudence. Pavia and Bologna 850-1150*, (Yale).

Rankin S. 1994 'Carolingian Music', ed. McKitterick 1994, *Carolingian Culture*, pp. 274-316.

Restelli G. 1984 *Goti, Tedeschi e Longobardi: Rapporti di Cultura e di Lingua*, (Brescia).

Reynolds S. 1983 'Medieval *origines gentium* and the Community of the Realm', *History* 68, pp. 375-90.

Reynolds S. 1984 *Kingdoms and Communities in Western Europe 900-1300*, (Oxford).

Romano G. 1959 'A Proposito di un Passo di Agnello Ravennate', *Storia Economica dell'Italia (Saggi di Storia Economica)*, ed. C. Cipolla, (Turin), vol. I, pp. 23-8.

Rösch G. 1982 *Venedig und das Reich. Handels- und Verkehrspolitische Beziehungen in der deutschen Kaiserzeit*, (Tübingen).

Ross J. B. 1945 'Two Neglected Paladins of Charlemagne: Erich of Friuli and Gerold of Bavaria', *Speculum* 20, pp. 212-35.

Rotili M. 1978 *La Miniatura nella Badia di Cava*, (Cava dei Tirreni), t. II.

Rovelli A. 1995 'Il Denaro di Pavia nell' Alto Medioevo (VIII-XI secolo)', *Bollettino della Società Pavese di Storia Patria*, anno XCV, n.s. vol. XLVII, pp. 71-90.

Ruggiero B. 1968 'Il Ducato di Spoleto e i Tentativi di Penetrazione dei Franchi nell'Italia Meridionale', *ASP Napoletane*, 3a ser. V-VI (LXXXIV-LXXXV), pp. 77-116.

Russo-Mailler C. 1982 'La Politica Meridionale di Ludovico II e il "*Rythmus de captivitate Ludovici imperatoris*", *Quaderni Medievali* 14, pp. 6-27.

Salvioli G. 1925 *La Storia del Diritto Italiano*, 3 vols. (Milan).

Sambon A. 1919 *Recueil des Monnaies Médiévales du Sud de l'Italie avant la Domination des Normands*, (Paris).

Sandmann M. 1984 *Herrscherverzeichnisse als Geschichtsquellen. Studien zur langobardisch-italienischen Überlieferung*, (Münstersche Mittelalter-Schreiben bd. 41).

Santifaller L. 1960 'Über die Verbal-Invokation in der älteren Papsturkunden', *Römische Historische Mitteilungen* 3, pp. 18-113.

Savigni R. 1992 'I Papi e Ravenna: Dalla Caduta dell'Esarcato alla Fine del sec. IX', *SRavenna* II.2, pp. 331-68.

Schaller D. 1978 'Alkuin', *Die Deutsche Literatur des Mittelalters. Verfasserlexikon*, vol. I, pp. 241-53.

Schmidinger H. 1962 'Die Besetzung des Patriarchenstuhles von Aquileja bis zur Mitte des 13 Jahrhunderts', *MIÖG* 50, pp.; repr. in *ibid. Patriarch im Abendland. Beiträge zur*

Geschichte des Papsttums, Roms und Aquileias im Mittelalter, (Salzburg, 1986), eds. H. Doppsch, H. Koller, P. F. Krammel, pp. 277-96.

Schmitz G. 1990 'The Capitulary Legislation of Louis the Pious', eds. Godman & Collins 1990, pp. 425-36 [orig. publ. in German in *DA* 42 (1986), pp. 471-516].

Schneidmuller B. 1993 'Pippin I', 'Pippin II', *Lexikon des Mittelalters*, vol. VI, cols. 2170-2.

Schramm P. E. 1929 *Kaiser, Rom und Renovatio. Studien und Texte zur Geschichte des römischen Erneuerungsgedankens vom Ende des Karolingischen Reiches bis zum Investiturstreit*, (Berlin).

Schramm P. E. & Mütherich F. E. 1962 *Denkmale der deutschen Könige und Kaiser. Ein Beitrag zur Herrscher Geschichte von Karl dem Großen bis Friedrich II. 768-1250*, (Veröffentlichungen des Zentralinstituts für Kunstgeschichte II; Munich).

Schumacher-Wolfgarten R. 1994, 'XPICTIANA RELIGIO. Zu einer Münzprägung Karls des Großen', *Jahrbuch für Antike und Christentum* 37, pp. 122-41.

Sestan E. 1950 'Per la Storia di un'Idea Storiografica: l'Idea di una Unità della Storia Italiana', *RSI* 62, pp. 180-98.

Sestan E. 1952 *Stato e Nazione nell'alto medioevo*, (Naples).

Settia A. 1991 *Chiese, Strade e Fortezze nell'Italia Medievale*, (Rome).

Settia G. 1987 'Pavia Carolingia e Post-Carolingia', *SPavia* II, pp. 69-155.

Speck K. 1978 *Konstantin VI: Die Legitimation einer Fremden und der Versuch einer eigenen Herrschaft*, (Munich, 2 vols.)

Stafford P. 1978 'Historical Implications of the Regional Production of Dies under Aethelred II', *British Numismatic Journal* XLVIII, pp. 35-51.

Storia della Cultura Veneta 1976 vol. I (Vicenza).

Storia della Civiltà Veneziana 1979, ed. V. Branca, vol. I, (Florence).

Storia di Brescia 1963 vol. I (Brescia).

Storia di Milano 1954 vol. II (Milan).

Storia di Napoli 1969 vol. II (Naples).

Storia di Pavia 1987 vol. II *L'Alto Medioevo* (Milan).

Storia di Piacenza 1990 vol. I (Piacenza).

Storia di Ravenna 1992 ed. A. Carile, (Venice).

Storia di Venezia 1992 *Dalle Origini alla Caduta della Repubblica* (Venice), vol. I.

Szövérfy J. 1970 *Weltliche Dichtungen des Lateinischen Mittelalters*, (Berlin).

Tabacco G. 1966 *I Liberi del Re nell'Italia Carolingia e Postcarolingia*, (Biblioteca degli «Studi Medievali II»; Spoleto).

Tabacco G. 1967 'Il Regno Italico nei secoli IX-XI', *Ordinamenti Militari in Occidente nell'Alto Medioevo* (SSpol XV.2, 1967, publ. 1968), pp. 763-90.

Tabacco G. 1969 'Dai Possessori dell'età Carolingia agli esercitanti dell'età Longobarda', *SM* ser 3 X.1, pp. 221-68.

Tabacco G. 1975 'L'Ambiguità delle Istituzioni nell'Europa Costruita dei Franchi', *RSI* 87, pp. 401-38.

Tabacco G. 1986 'Il Volto Ecclesiastico del Potere nell'Età Carolingia', *Storia d'Italia: la Chiesa e il Potere Ecclesiastico dal Medioevo all'Età Contemporanea* (Annali 9; Turin), pp. 7-41.

Tabacco G. 1989 *The Struggle for Power in Medieval Italy*, (Cambridge).

Tabacco G. 1990 'L'Avvento dei Carolingi nel Regno dei Longobardi', eds. S. Gasparri & P. Cammorasano, *Langobardia*, pp. 375-403.

Tamassia N. & Ussani V. 1923 'Epica e Storia in Alcuni Capitoli di Agnello Ravennate', *Studi Medievali* I, pp. 9-40.

Taviani-Carozzi H. 1991 *La Principauté de Salerne IXe-XIe Siècle*, 2 vols. (Collection de l'École Française de Rome 152; Rome).

Testi-Rasponi A. 1913 'Note Agnelliane. La Data dell'elezione dell'Arcivescovo Giorgio', *Felix Ravenna* 12, pp. 515-17.

Thompson M. 1966 'The Monogram of Charlemagne in Greek', *American Numismatic Society, Museum Notes* XII, pp. 125-7 [repr. in Grierson, *Dark Age Numismatics*].

- Toubert P. 1973** *Les Structures du Latium Médiéval. Le Latium méridional et la Sabine du IXe à la Fin du XIIe siècle*, 2 vols, (Bibliothèque des Écoles Françaises d'Athènes et de Rome 221).
- Traube L. 1892** 'O Roma Nobilis !' *Philologische Untersuchungen aus dem Mittelalter. Abhandlungen der philos. -philog. Klasse der kgl. Bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften* 19, pp. 299-395.
- Ullmann W. 1962** *The Growth of Papal Government in the Middle Ages*, (2nd edn., London).
- Ullmann W. 1969** *The Carolingian Renaissance and the Idea of Kingship*, (London).
- Vasina A. 1991** 'Agnello Andrea', *Repertorio della Cronachistica Emiliano-Romagnola (secc. IX-XV)*, (Istituto Storico Italiano per il Medio Evo - Nuovi Studi Storici 11; Rome), pp. 35-43.
- Vecchiato L. 1987** 'Educazione e Cultura dal Sec. IX al sec. XII in Verona', *Verona dalla Caduta dei Carolingi al Libero Comune*, (Atti del Convegno 24-26 Maggio 1985, publ. 1987 - Accademia di Agricoltura, Scienza e Lettere di Verona), pp. 187-224.
- Verzeichnis der Handschriften der Stiftsbibliothek von St. Gallen* 1875, ed. G. Scherrer, (Halle).
- Verzone P. 1942** *L'Architettura Religiosa dell'Alto Medio Evo nell'Italia Settentrionale*, (Milan).
- Villa C. 1992** 'I Classici', eds. G. Cavallo, C. Leonardi, E. Menestó, *Lo Spazio Letterario del Medioevo, I Il Medioevo Latino*, (Rome), pp. 479-522.
- Violante C. 1953** *La Società Milanese nell'età Pre-comunale*, (Istituto Italiano per gli Studi Storici in Napoli 4. Bari).
- Violante C. 1961** 'La Chiesa Bresciana nel Medioevo', *SBrescia* I, pp. 1000f.
- Violante C. 1994** *Landscapes of Fear. Perceptions of Nature and the City in the Middle Ages*, (Cambridge).
- Viscardi A. 1950** *Le Origini. Storia Letteraria d'Italia*. (Milan).
- Völckers H. 1965** *Karolingische Münzfunde der Frühzeit (751-800). Pippin, Karlmann, Karl der Große*, (Abhandlungen der Akademie der Wissenschaften in Göttingen Philologisch-Historische Klasse III, Ab. 61).

Wallace-Hadrill J. M. 1971 *Early Germanic Kingship in England and on the Continent*, (Oxford).

Wallach L. 1959 *Alcuin and Charlemagne*, (New York).

Ward-Perkins B. 1984 *From Classical Antiquity to the Middle Ages: Urban Public Building in Northern and Central Italy AD 300-850*, (Oxford).

Wattenbach & Levison W., ed. H. Löwe 1963 *Deutschlands Geschichtesquellen im Mittelalter: Vorzeit und Karolinger*, vol. 4 (Weimar).

Werner K. F. 1990 'Hludowicus Augustus - Gouverner l'Empire Chrétien - idées et réalités', eds. Godman & Collins 1990, pp. 3-123.

Westerbergh U. 1957 *Beneventan Ninth Century Poetry*, (Studia Latina Stockholmiensia IV; Lund).

Wickham C. J. 1980 'Economic and Social Institutions in Northern Tuscany in the 8th Century', *Istituzioni Ecclesiastiche della Toscana Medioevale*, (Commissione Italiana per la Storia delle Pievi e delle Parrocchia, Studi e Ricerche 1; Galatina), pp. 7-34.

Wickham C. J. 1981 *Early Medieval Italy*, (London).

Wickham C. J. 1985 'Lawyer's Time: History and Memory in Tenth- and Eleventh-Century Italy', *Studies In Medieval History Presented to R. H. C. Davis*, (London), pp. 53-72.

Wickham C. J. 1994 *The Mountains and the City*, (Oxford).

Wickhoff F. 1888 'Die monasteria bei Agnellus', *MIÖG* 9, pp. 34-45.

Wolfram H. 1967 *Intitulatio I Lateinische Königs- und Fürstentitel bis zum Ende des 8 Jahrhunderts*, (*MIÖG* Ergänzb. XXI; Graz, Vienna, Cologne).

Wolfram H. 1971 'Lateinische Herrschertitel im neunten und zehnten Jahrhundert', ed. H. Wolfram, *Intitulatio II. Lateinische Herrscher-und Fürstentitel im neunten und zehnten Jhdt.*, pp. 19-178 (*MIÖG* Ergänzungsband XXIV.).

Wolfram H. 1990 'Le genre de l'*origo gentis*', *Revue Belge* LXVIII. 4, pp. 789-801.

Wormald P. 1977 'Lex Scripta and Verbum Regis: Royal Legislation from Euric to Cnut', eds. P. Sawyer & I. N. Wood, *Early Medieval Kingship*, (Leeds), pp. 105-38.

Zanna P. 1991 '«Descriptiones Urbium» and Elegy in Latin and Vernacular, in the Early Middle Ages. At the Crossroads between Civic Engagement, Artistic Enthusiasm and Religious Meditation', *Studi Medievali* XXXII, II, pp. 523-96.

Zimmermann H. 1974 'Imperatores Italiae', *Historische Forschungen für Walter Schlesinger*, (Cologne, Vienna), pp. 378-99.

